

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXI.

BALTIMORE, JANUARY, 1906.

No. 1.

THE SOURCES OF BEN JONSON'S *News from the New World Discovered in the Moon*.

The sources of Jonson's masque, *News from the New World Discovered in the Moon*, were Lucian's *Vera Historia* and *Icaro-Menippus*, both of which deal with trips to the moon. Jonson's indebtedness to the Greek writer is clearly indicated in the following lines :

1 Herald. No, I assure you, he rather flew upon the wings of his muse. There are in all but three ways of going thither : one is Endymion's way, by rapture in sleep, or a dream. [Cf. *Vera Historia*.¹ "And he, in return, related to us his own history, and informed us, that he also was a man, that his name was Endymion, that he had been taken away from our earth in his sleep, and brought to this place where he reigned as sovereign."'] The other Menippus's way, by wing, which the poet took. [The reference is to the *Icaro-Menippus*. "I took, you must know, a very large eagle, and a vultur also, one of the strongest I could get, and cut off their wings. . . . To make wings for myself, was impossible, but to fit those of a vultur and an eagle to my body, might, I imagined, answer the same purpose. I resolved, therefore, to try the experiment, and cut off the right wing of one and the left of the other ; bound them on with thongs, and at the extremities made loops for my hands." Thus equipped, Menippus made his way directly to the moon]. The third, old Empedocles's way ; who, when he leaped into Ætna, having a dry sear body, and light, the smoke took him, and whift him up into the moon, where he lives yet waving up and down like a feather, all soot and embers, coming out of that coal-pit : our poet met him, and talk'd with him. [According to Lucian, Menippus encountered Empedocles in the moon. "On a sudden Empedocles the philosopher stood behind me, all over ashes, as black as a coal, and dreadfully scorched : when I saw him, I must own I was frightened, and took him for some dæmon of the moon ; but he came up to me, and cried out, 'Menippus, don't be afraid,

I am no god, why call'st thou me divine ?

¹ The translation is by Thomas Francklin, 1780.

I am Empedocles the naturalist : after I had leaped into the furnace, a vapour from Ætna, carried me up hither, and here I live in the moon, and feed upon dew.'"]

Compare this last statement with the following from Jonson :

Fact. How do they live then ?

1 Her. On the dew of the moon, like grasshoppers, and confer with the doppers.²

The motive for the journey is thoroughly characteristic of Lucian. Menippus undertakes the trip because, after listening to all the philosophers of Greece, he finds nothing but contradiction and confusion.

"I could not tell how to refuse my assent to these high-sounding and long-bearded gentlemen, and yet could find no argument amongst them all, that had not been refuted by some or other of them ; often was I on the point of giving credit to one, when, as Homer says,

To other thoughts,
My heart inclin'd.

The only way, therefore, to put an end to all my doubts, was, I thought, to make a bird of myself, and fly up to heaven."

This idea, so cleverly developed by Lucian, seems to have been in Jonson's mind when he wrote the following :

Print. Right, and as well read of you, i' faith : for Cornelius Agrippa has it, *in disco lunæ*, there 'tis found.

1 Her. Sir, you are lost, I assure you : for ours came to you neither by the way of Cornelius Agrippa, nor Cornelius Dribble.

2 Her. Nor any glass of —

1 Her. No philosopher's phant'sie.

2 Her. Mathematician's perspicil.

1 Her. Or brother of the Rosie Cross's intelligence, no forced way, but by the neat and clean power of poetry.

2 Her. The mistress of all discovery.

1 Her. Who after a world of these curious uncertainties, hath employed thither a servant of her's in search of truth.

² Cf. also the following from the *Vera Historia* : "Their drink is air squeezed into a cup, which produces a kind of dew."

According to the *Vera Historia*, the moon was "like an island, round, shining, and remarkably full of light; we got on shore, and found on examination that it was cultivated, and full of inhabitants." These inhabitants, as the reader of Lucian knows, were stranger than any of the creatures described by Gulliver.

2 *Her.* Certain and sure news.

1 *Her.* Of a new world.

2 *Her.* And new creatures in that world.

1 *Her.* In the orb of the moon.

2 *Her.* Which is now found to be an earth inhabited.

1 *Her.* With navigable seas and rivers.

2 *Her.* Variety of nations, policies, laws.

1 *Her.* With havens in't, castles, and port towns.

Vera Historia: "I will now tell you every thing which I met with in the Moon, that was new and extraordinary. In the first place, they never breed there from women, but from men; they always marry males, and do not so much as know the name of woman; the men are wives till five and twenty, and then marry themselves. The fœtus is borne not in the womb, but in the calf of the leg," etc.

This doubtless inspired the following in Jonson:

1 *Her.* Only one island they have, is call'd the isle of the *Epicoenes*, because there under one article both kinds are signified, for they are fashioned alike, male and female the same; not heads and broad hats, short doublets and long points; neither do they ever untruss for distinction, but laugh and lie down in moon-shine, and stab with their poinards; you do not know the delight of the *Epicoenes* in moon-shine.

2 *Her.* And when they have tasted the springs of pleasure enough, and bill'd, and kist, and are ready to come away; the shees only lay certain eggs, (for they are never with child there,) and of these eggs are disclosed a race of creatures like men, but are indeed a sort of fowl, in part covered with feathers, (they call them *VOLATEES*,) that hop from island to island; you shall see a covey of them, if you please, presently . . .

[Enter the *VOLATEES* for the *ANTIMASQUE* and *DANCE*.]

These curious creatures thus introduced for the *antimasque* were obviously suggested by the strange creatures of the *Vera Historia*. The moon, according to Lucian, was peopled with such monsters. There were many kinds.

"As we were advancing forwards, we were

seized on a sudden by the *Hippogypi*,¹ for so it seems they were called by the inhabitants; these *Hippogypi* are men carried upon vulturs, which they ride as we do horses: these vulturs have each three heads, and are immensely large: you may judge of their size, when I tell you that one of their feathers is bigger than the mast of a ship. The *Hippogypi* have orders, it seems, to fly round the kingdom, and if they find any stranger, to bring him to the king." The *Lachanopteri* were "very large birds, whose feathers are of a kind of herb, and whose wings look like lettuces." Other creatures, equally curious, made up the lunar population.

Most important of all, Jonson introduces the *Volatees* upon the stage with the following lines:

Then know we do not move these wings so soon
On which our poet mounted to the moon,
Menippus like, but all 'twixt it and us,
Thus clears and helps to the presentment, thus
[Enter the *VOLATEES*.]

These lines are meaningless unless the reader is familiar with Lucian's dialogue. Menippus, when he reached the moon, perceived the earth as a very small speck.

"I could not find the high mountains, and the great sea; and, if it had not been for the Rhodian Colossus, and the tower of Pharos, should not have known where the earth stood. . . . When I beheld the earth, but could not distinguish the objects upon it, on account of the immense distance, I was horribly vexed at it, and ready to cry, when, on a sudden, Empedocles the philosopher stood behind me. . . . 'Menippus, don't be afraid. . . . I am come to free you from your present distress . . . and now, how shall we contrive to make you see clear?' 'That, by Jove,' said I, 'I cannot guess, unless you can take off this mist from my eyes, for they are horribly dim at present.' 'You have brought the remedy along with you.' 'How so!' 'Have you not got an eagle's wing?' 'True, but what has that to do with an eye?' 'An eagle, you know, is more sharp sighted than any other creature, and the only one that can look against the sun: your true royal bird is known by never winking at the rays, be they ever so strong.' 'So I have heard, and I am sorry I did not, before I came up, take out my own eyes and put in the eagle's.'

¹ Literally *horse vultures*, from *ἵππος* and *γυψ*. *Volatees* is a word coined by Jonson from the Latin *volitare*. Cf. *volaticus*, flying, winged.

² In his translation, Francklin inadvertently ran together as one speech this and the preceding sentence.

'You may have one royal eye, for all that, if you please; it is only when you rise up to fly, holding the vultur's wing still, and moving the eagle's only; by which means, you will see clearly with one, though not at all with the other.' . . . I acted as he advised me, and no sooner moved my eagle's wing, than a great light came all around me, and I saw everything as clear as possible: looking down to earth, I beheld distinctly cities and men, and every thing that passed amongst them.'

If I interpret correctly, the Heralds, when they appeared on the stage, were fitted with wings as was Menippus. During the four lines just quoted, they moved their wings gently. This, like an enchantment, was supposed to bring to the vision of the spectators the surface of the moon peopled with Volatees.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

PARTINUPLÉS DE BLES. AN EPISODE
IN TIRSO'S *Amar por Señas*. LOPE'S
La viuda valenciana.

Bödtker¹ has recently published a masterly treatment of *Parténopeus de Blois*, in European literature, correcting and completing the various studies by Kölbing, Massman and others, although primarily concerned only with the relations of the Icelandic and Danish versions to the Old French poem. On the whole, one needs must subscribe to the classification proposed by Bödtker,² but there are certain tests which he has neglected to use, and which might modify his classification in minor details. Some points may be mentioned here for reconsideration. No use has been made, for instance, of Weingärtner,³ and the fragment published by Wülker from the Lord Robartes' manuscript,⁴ has received no mention whatsoever.

¹ *Parténopeus de Blois. Étude comparative . . .* par A. Trampe Bödtker. *Videnskabs-Selskabets Skrifter, II. Hist.-Filos. Kl.* 1904, No. 3.

² Cf. Stengel's favorable, although brief, review in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1905, cols. 34-35.

³ *Die mittelhochl. Fassungen der P.-sage und ihr Verhältnis zum altfranz. Originale*. Breslau, 1888.

⁴ *Anglia*, Vol. XII, pp. 607 ff. Cf. also Kölbing, *Englische Studien*, Vol. XIV, pp. 435-7.

I would not insist upon the importance of this fragment, and refer to it merely for the sake of completeness. No copy of the Crapelet edition of *Parténopeus de Blois* being accessible to me, I refrain from discussing its relation to the other English fragments, or to the Old French poem. It doubtless belongs to the group Y. Long since, Köhler, in a discussion of a passage in the *Orlando Furioso*,⁵ threw out a hint that might have served both Bödtker and Sneyders de Vogel⁶ in good stead. Such an episode—*das vom Sterbenden nicht vollendete Wort*⁷—is a very important one for fixing the filiation of the various versions and adaptations. It is not in Konrad von Würzburg's version, nor in those of the Peninsula. How far this is due to chance, it would be impossible to determine. As for the Spanish and Catalan versions, it will be seen below that exception may be made to Bödtker's classification.

Before coming to the subject proper of this article, attention may be called to the striking use of the Spanish name Urraque in *Parténopeus*.—Of the soil too is the episode in which the hero on his return to the enchanted palace is heart-broken because he has forgotten to bid farewell to the fifty Spanish subjects at the court of the French king.—In some of the manuscripts of *Parténopeus*, the spelling Urracle is found; but the rime with *miracle* puts us on our guard against a learned orthography.⁸ The name is extremely rare in mediæval French literature, if, indeed, it occurs at all outside of the poem in discussion. Diligent search in the *chansons de geste*—confirmed by Langlois' *Table des noms propres . . . dans les chansons de geste*,—and in *romans d'aventure*, etc., has revealed not a single instance of its use. In the name and episode referred to we may simply have another instance of Spanish and French interrelations during the twelfth century,⁹

⁵ *Eine Stelle in Ariostos Orlando Furioso und Nachahmungen derselben*. Archiv, 1876. Cf. *Kleinere Schriften*, Vol. III, pp. 1 ff.

⁶ *La suite du Parthénopeu de Blois et la version Hollandaise*, *Revue des langues romanes*, 1905, pp. 5 ff.

⁷ Melior does not die, however, on pronouncing *Parto*, but her voice grows feeble as she concludes with—*noupeu*.

⁸ Cf. *Saint Jaque: Romacle*, [Fabliau] Du chevalier à la robe vermeille.

⁹ Cf. Puymaigre, *Revue Hispanique*, 1895, pp. 163 ff.

rather than an indication that the legend first appeared in the Peninsula.

The object of the present article is, however, to define more exactly the bibliography of the chap-book as printed in the Peninsula, and to attempt a classification of the many prints.¹⁰

CASTILIAN I. 1513?-1705?

On account of the erroneous reference given by Antonio to an edition, printed at Tarragona, 1488 (most recently discussed by Haebler, *Bibliografía Ibérica del siglo XV*), it used to be argued that the earliest edition published in Spain was Catalan. Hence, too, certain theories as to Catalan authorship (cf. Gallardo, No. 1017 n.). The earliest edition seems to have been one published at Alcalá de Henares, 1513. Haebler refers to a copy in the University Library at Barcelona, without date or place. He feels sure that it did not appear before 1500; but he fails to give further details. The Castilian editions up to 1705(?) followed the Alcalá text very closely; then appeared a new adaptation, the work of a certain Gaspar Aldana (cf. *infra*).

- *1513. Alcalá de Henares. Mentioned in the Bure catalogue. Probably lost. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1017.
- ? (1515. Alcalá de Henares. Referred to by Moratín, a careless bibliographer, in his *Orígenes del teatro*. Cf. Rivad., Vol. II, p. 174. The title is the same as in the edition just cited, and the inference is that 1515 ought to read 1513.)
- 1526. Toledo. The oldest edition now accessible, (Mazarine Library). Described by Gallardo, No. 1018, etc.
- *1547. Burgos. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1020. Bib. del Excmo. Sr. D. José de Salamanca. Amador de los Ríos, Vol. VII, p. 377, n. 1. Brunet states that there is a copy in the Mazarine Library; if so, it was not accessible to me in 1903-4 when I copied the Toledo text.
- Alcalá [de Henares] referred to by Ebert. The cataloguers of the British Museum Library make the query whether the mutilated edition described below is of this date and place. Buckley's reference in his edition of the English version of *Parténopous, Roxburghe Club*, 1862, p. xxxvi, is apparently not at first-hand.
- *1548. Sevilla, Ebert, etc. Details in Gallardo, No. 1022. I have not succeeded in finding a copy of this edition.
- ? (1558. Sevilla, cited by Conchu (*Bibliothèque des Romans*, dec. 1779). The description of this

edition corresponds with the Sevilla edition of 1548, and may be an error (?). No copy known.)

- 1560? Sevilla? British Mus. Mutilated copy. Cf. above, edition of Alcalá, 1547. Gallardo refers to this edition, No. 1021. Read, however, muye | forçado (sic). It was published probably about 1560, and in Sevilla, as may be inferred from the fact that two copies of another chap-book (*La historia del rey Canamor*), in apparently the same series, are dated 1567 and 1588 respectively. The colophon of the second states that the work was printed *en Sevilla, en casa de Sebastian Trugillo*. In both, however, although the press-work is strikingly alike, the title is in red, not in black, as in the *Partinuplés* text.

Gallardo, No. 1019, refers to an edition in the British Museum, without date or place. But such a text (in Gothic letter) is no longer there. It might repay the pains to compare Gallardo's description with the copy in the University of Barcelona.

- 1623. Valladolid. Bibl. Nat. Paris. Inv. Res. Ybis 1,077. Sign. A₂-F₄. *El Conde Partinuplés* (wood-cut: draped horse, prancing). *Libro del esforçado cauallero el Conde Partinuplés, | que fue Emperador de Constantinopla*. Impreso con licencia en | Valladolid, por la viuda de Francisco Fernandnz [sic] de Cordoua, Año de 1623.
- ? (1643. Sevilla. Referred to at first-hand by Conchu alone. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1024.)
- *1643. Sevilla. The unique copy of this edition, different from the one just referred to, is in the University Library of Göttingen. I am indebted to Dr. Reicke for the following description: *El Conde Partinuplés, La coronica de el muy valiente, y esforçado Cavallero el Conde Partinuplés, y de sus grandes hechos en Armas . . .* Impreso en Seulla, por Pedro Gomez de Pastrana. A la Esquina de la Carcel Real. Año de 1643.
- *1693. Sevilla. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1025.

CASTILIAN II. 1705?-1856?

About 1700 appeared an abridged edition of *Partinuplés* "compvesta" by a certain Gaspar Aldana. About Aldana the works accessible to me are silent. His text follows the original rather closely, but the following changes are to be noted: The Pope's niece, who is to become Partinuplés' wife, is given a name, Elenisa; Gaudin becomes Guadin. There are minor changes in the wording, but the plot remains the same. Aldana's text was reprinted as in the 1705? edition until about 1856?.

- 1705? Madrid. *Historia | del Noble, y esforzado Cauallero, | el conde | Partinuplés, | Emperador | de*

¹⁰ Texts of which there are inadequate descriptions, or which have not been examined by the present writer, are marked by an asterisk, and are classified by inference alone.

Constantinopla. | *Compuesta por Gaspar Aldana.* (Wood-cut: knight on horse-back.) *Con licencia: En Madrid, por Francisco Sanz.* . . . In fol. Without date, but another chap-book (*La historia de Carlo Magno*) in the same series, is dated 1705. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

- *1739. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble, | y esforzado caballero | el conde Partinuplés | emperador | de Constantinopla | compuesta | por Gaspar | Aldana | Año* (wood-cut, knight on horse-back, between banners) 1739. *Hallarase en Madrid en la Imprenta de Antonio Sanz | en la Plazuela de la calle de la Paz | . 40 pp., 4to.* This edition has been neglected by bibliographers. The only copy is at the Royal Library, Berlin, and I owe the description of it to the kindness of Dr. Perlbach.

1756. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble, | y esforzado cavallero | el conde | Partinoples . . . compuesta | por Gaspar Aldana,* (wood-cut: two knights attacking each other), *Año 1756. Hallarase en Madrid en la Imprenta de | Antonio Sanz . . . In fol.* Brit. Mus.

1756. Valencia. Salvá, No. 1655.

- 1800? Córdoba. *Historia | del muy noble y esforzado caballero | El conde Partinuples | . . . compuesta por Gaspar Aldana. | Con licencia: En Córdoba, en la imprenta de D. Rafael Garcia | Rodriguez, Calle de la Librería.* This edition Salvá (No. 1654) places about 1750, but in one of the chap-books of this series (Bibl. Nat., Paris, Inv. Res. Y² 1,040), *Historia del descubrimiento de las tierras de los Gigantes*, there is a reference to an event which occurred in 1792. A copy in the Bibl. Nac., Madrid, also in Brit. Mus., whose catalogue asks whether this edition is of the year 1820.

CASTILIAN III. 1856—.

About 1856 there appeared in Madrid an abridged and sorely mutilated version of Aldana's text. This process of mutilation and curtailment was not limited to our chap-book, but is noticeable in a large number of others. It is these garbled editions that the vendors of *libros de cordel* to-day sell in the markets and highways of Spain, with their characteristic cry: *leyenda! leyenda! mejor que en los libros* [sic!]. The most important changes in the text are: Julian becomes Juan; Melior is now called Leonisa (a corruption of Elenisa, the Pope's niece, and now no longer named?); Urrique becomes Oriana,¹¹ but is no longer Melior's step-sister, but a lady-in-waiting; Guadin's (sic) marriage is not mentioned at all.

1856. Madrid. (Wood-cut: knight addressing a lady on a throne.) *Historia | del muy noble y es-*

forzado caballero | conde Partinoples | el cual llegó á ser emperador de Constantinopla | Reformada y compendiada de la que compuso Gaspar Aldana | Madrid. | Se hallará de venta en la Plaza de Riego . . . 1856. 7 chapters, 32 pages, 4°.

1878. Madrid. *Historia | del muy noble y esforzado caballero | Conde Partinoples, . . . Reformada, etc. Madrid: 1878. | Despacho calle de Juanelo, num. 19. 4 pliegos, 4°.*

- 1880? Madrid, Barcelona. *Historia del muy noble | y esforzado caballero | conde Partinoples | Reformada, etc. | Despachos: | Madrid | Hernando, Arenal || Barcelona | Bou de la Plaza Nueva, 13. 4 pliegos, 4°.* I have a copy.

CASTILIAN IV. UNCLASSIFIED.

- *1700. Barcelona? Valladolid? Gayangos, Rivad., Vol. XL, p. lxxxii, states that Salvá in the *Repertorio Americano* refers to an edition of about the year 1700, without date or place, but probably of Barcelona or Valladolid.

1842. Barcelona. *Historia | del esforçado cavallero | Partinoples | conde de Bles; | . . . ahora nuevamente traducida de la lengua catalana | en la nuestra castellana . . . En Barcelona: | Por José Torner | calle del Regomí No. 22 | 1842. 4°.* This edition is the only Castilian text translated from Catalan. The work is preceded by a prologue by the "editores" (i. e., publishers). They state, among other remarks, that the Castilian edition indicated by Moratín (cf. *supra*) being inaccessible to them, they have been obliged to resort to the *traducción catalana que corre en dos* [sic] *distintas impresiones, una de Barcelona y otra de Tarragona. Tenemos noticia de otra edición mas antigua también catalana, que no nos ha sido dable ver por lo mucho que escasean los ejemplares . . .* The only old Catalan edition of Barcelona that has been recorded is the one cited by Brunet (cf. *infra*). The Tarragona edition may be the one of 1700?, and the older print referred to would be the Tarragona edition of 1588. The archaisms in this translation are striking and puzzling, e. g.: vido = vió (p. 167); en le viendo Guadin, demandógele (p. 168); habedes (*ibid.*); estonce (*ibid.*); los sus dos pages (p. 169), etc. These are not Catalanisms, but why should archaic speech be affected in such a work? I have a copy. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

CATALAN I. 1588—.

Morel-Fatio (*Grundriss der roman. Phil.*, II, 2, p. 124) repeats the doubts of previous critics, (1) as to whether the Catalan version is derived from a French or Provençal

¹¹ From *Amadis*; Leonisa and Elenisa recall Elisena of the same work.

origin, or (2) whether it is a translation from the Castilian. It may be noted, (1) that no Provençal edition is recorded, (2) that the earliest known Catalan edition appeared seventy-five years after the first Castilian edition, and, moreover, distinctly states on the title page, *novament traduyda de llengua castellana en la nostra cathalana*. But,—and here's the rub,—was this Catalan edition based on the Castilian version as it has come down to us? The oldest Catalan edition, now accessible, is one of Tarragona, 1700? (*cf. infra*). The title corresponds closely with that of the 1588 edition described by Gallardo, No. 1023, and one may infer that the contents are the same. It is true that the Catalan editions, without exception, bear on the title-page the words, *novament traduyda*, etc., but, as will be seen in the bibliographical examination below, the remark is merely reprinted from previous editions, an examination of the editions subsequent to 1700, at least, showing no influence of the Castilian text. To return to the difficulty noted above, Gaudin in the Catalan version *se feu Christià, y fonch casat ab la Donzella Urraca*. Castilian, Nos. I, II, simply state, *desque fue tornado christiana luego lo hizo condestable de su imperio z lo caso con una donzella hija dalgo z muy hermosa* (the edition of 1705? *con una Dama muy noble y muy hermosa*). In Castilian No. III, no mention of Gaudin's marriage is made. Castilian, No. IV, follows the Catalan version. Is it a mere coincidence that the earliest Castilian edition in this detail resembles all the manuscripts of the Old French version, except the Arsenal copy, whereas the Catalan text is like the versions of the North and the Italian story of Gherardino and Fata Bianca? It would appear then (1) that the words, *novament traduyda* are a figment, or, (2) that an intermediate Castilian text, differing in this respect from the extant version, has been lost. At any rate, Bödtker's classification requires some readjustment, or a more satisfactory solution of the problem just raised.

*1588. Tarragona. Cf. Gallardo, No. 1033.

1700? Tarragona. *Assi comensa | la general historia | del Esforçat cavaller . . . y al ultim và anyadida una Decima burlesca* (wood-cut: knight with lance). Tarragona: *Per Magi Canals Estamper, y Llibreter, al carrer Mayor*. 4°. n. d. Bibl. Nac., Madrid. Brit. Mus.

1700? An imperfect copy in the Bibl. Nac., Madrid (R. 8316), is very similar to the edition just described. Last page (182) begins, *llur estat: y nostre Senyor Jesu Chrit.* n. d.

1700? Gerona. Three editions appeared at Gerona, published by the Bros. (a) Gallardo, No. 1026 (*Joseph Bró . . . en la Plaza del Vi*); a copy in the Imperial library at Vienna. (b) I have a copy similar to the one just mentioned, but *Per Joseph Bró, als quatre Cantons*. Buckley had a copy of this edition *op. cit.*, p. xlvii). (c) Gallardo notes a third, *Per Jaume Bró*, 8°. My friend, M. Lemaître, gives me the following details of another Gerona edition (likewise without date), at

the Bibl. Nat. Paris (Y² 14706), *Assi comensa | la general historia | del esforsat cavaller | Partinoples | comptes [sic] de Bles, y apres fonch | emperador de Constantinolla [sic?] Novament traduhida de llengua castellana | etc.* (Wood-cut, as in Gerona edition (b). *Ab llicencia | Gerona: en la estampa de Anton Oliva, estamper, y llibreter en las ballesterras*. 8°, 155 pp. and 5 not paginated, containing likewise the *obligació que tenen los marits, y las mellers*, also the *Decimus burlescas*[?]

*1700? Barcelona. Brunet refers to an edition, without date, published by Rafel Figueró. 8°.

1720. Vich. *Assi comensa | la general historia | del esforçat | Cavaller | Partinoples, | Comte de Bles: y apres | . . .* (wood-cut, as in previously cited Catalan prints). Vich: *Per Joan Dorca, y Morera Estamper*. 164 pp. Brit. Mus. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

1844. Barcelona. *Historia | del esforçat cavaller | Partinobles | Comte de Bles. | y apres fonch | Emperador . . . Escrita [sic!] en nostra llengua Catalana. | Barcelona: Estampa de Miguel Borrás . . .* 1844. Small octavo. Bibl. Nac., Madrid.

Readers of Tirso de Molina's *Amor por señas* (1606?) must have been struck by the peculiar atmosphere of mystery that pervades Act I, with vague reminiscences of *Partinoplés de Bles*, all confirmed by Montoya's remark:

Si te encanta
qualche princesa o infanta,
llámate Partinuplés.

(Ed. 1839, Vol. VIII, p. 27.)

There can be little doubt but that the introductory episode of this play is a conscious reproduction, or adaptation, of the chap-book under discussion,—and the result is an infinitely more valuable product than Ana Caro's mediocre comedia, *El conde Partinuplés*. Calderon, somewhat later, imitated the first act of *Amar por señas* in *El encanto sin encanto* (*Jornada segunda, escena XVI*, to the end of the play). The story of *Partinuplés de Bles* haunted the writers of Spain, more especially during the first half of the seventeenth century, as might be shown by the constant reference to our hero.¹²

¹² The earliest reference is probably in the *glosa* to the romance:

Oh Belerma! Oh Belerma!

Por mi mal fuiste engendrada. The *glosa* may be read in

It will be recalled that the scene of *Amar por señas* is in France (Lorraine).¹³ Gabriel is enamoured of Beatriz, who, however, is to wed his master. He flees from Lorraine. Meanwhile a servant of Beatriz overtakes him and deprives him of his *maleta* in the hope that their mistress may thus identify Gabriel whom she loves. He pursues the thief and is finally lost in a *Sala de la quinta*. *Una chimenea; un torno como de monjas en la pared, una luz en un bufete*. He exclaims:

Hombre ¿estás encantado?
 Cuando corro tras ti por bosque y prado,
 sus alas te da el viento;
 si te pierdo de vista, a paso lento
 me aguardas; . . .
 Siguiéndote me traes de sala en sala,
 despues que en esta quinta
 entraste, que de Circe hechizos pinta;
 sola y deshabitada,
 de luces y tápices adornada.
 A nadie en ella veo.
 O loco estoy, o lo que sueño creo.

The thief extinguishes the light and escapes, leaving Gabriel alone. Meanwhile the lacquey, Montoya, has been let down the chimney. The *torno* revolves, *con dos luces en candeleros de plata, recado para escribir y un billete*. Presently it revolves again: *Vuelvese el torno con luz y con un tabaque grande y curioso lleno de comida: Cubrenle unos manteles, y sobre ellos viene otro papel*.

At this point the lacquey exclaims:

Si te encanta
 qualche princesa o infanta,
 llámate Partinuplés.

Here the element of mystery comes to a close and the resemblance to the story of *Partinuplés de Bles* ceases. Not to be overlooked, however, is

Gallardo, Vol. I, col. 588; *ibid.*, col. 822. Salvá, Vol. I, pp. 29-30, refers to a copy of about 1530. The reference to Hernando de Andrada, a general under Charles V, might help to fix the date more precisely. A reference by Loyola (Macedonio de) in his *Viaje y naufragio de Macedonio de Loyola*, 1587, shows how *Partinuplés* had by the end of the sixteenth century become part and parcel of Spanish literature, as much as *Amadís de Gaula*, or the *Doce Pares*.

¹³ The contents of the *Partinuplés* chap-book are easily accessible in Dunlop's *History of Fiction*, 1888, Vol. I, pp. 406 ff., or of the Old French poem in Gröber's *Grundriss*, Vol. II, pp. 586-7. Tirso's play is quoted from the 1839 edition, Vol. VIII.

Filipo's remark (p. 89) to Armesinda, *Condesa de Bles eres*.¹⁴

It seems to have escaped the notice of critics that the plot of Lope de Vega's *La viuda valenciana* (ca. 1604)¹⁵ is strikingly reminiscent of *Partinuplés*. This a brief analysis of the play will show: Leonarda, a rich widow, living in retirement, is averse to all thoughts of a second marriage. But one day she sees Camilo and becomes enamoured of him. Lest she incur criticism for her fickleness, more especially as she has long repelled the advances of suitors, she has Camilo meet her servant, by night, at a certain bridge. There he is blindfolded and conducted to her presence. She forbids him ever to attempt to see her. These mysterious interviews are continued for some time, until Camilo determines, even at the risk of his life, to solve the mystery. To this end he conceals a lantern under his cloak; on producing it, she cries out. Her uncle enters, and, to be brief, she is obliged to admit her love for Camilo, and concludes by marrying him.

It would be difficult to decide whether Lope took the suggestion for this plot from Apuleius, or from *Partinuplés*. The *Golden Ass* was a familiar book in Spain; moreover, Lope makes Camilo say,—in reply to the servant's suggestion that he take along a lantern,—

Podráme costar la vida,
 Floro, aqueste atrevimiento;
 Que si Psíques vió al Amor,
 A quien á oscuras gozaba
 Perdió la gloria en que estaba,
 Y negoció su dolor.

(ed. Rivad., p. 80 c.)

On the other hand, Lope's plot resembles that of *Partinuplés* more closely, especially in the following important details: firstly, in the matter of the sexes of the protagonists, and, secondly, in the conclusion. In the story of Cupid and Psyche, it is Cupid who forbids Psyche to attempt to see

¹⁴ It may be noted here that the reference in *Don Gil de las Calzas verdes*, ed. Bourland, 1901, pp. 142-3, is not to what is distant so much as to what is mysterious. Cf. especially, *El Castigo del penséque*, Vol. V, p. 135; and *El Amparo de los hombres*, fol. 7 vo. in the copy of the Royal Library at Munich. A good instance is in Tirso, vol. V, p. 292.

¹⁵ Not 1619, as in Rennert, p. 263. For plays based on the Apuleius story, see Schmidt, *Die S. Calderon's*, ch. 76.

him. In Apuleius, too, the irate god flies from Psyche, leaving her a prey to remorse. In *Par-tinuplēs*, on the contrary, Melior is, indeed, wroth, but a marriage finally ensues.

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Chicago.

CYNEWULF, *Christ* 1320.

In the note on *synrūst* in my edition, reproduced from *Mod. Lang. Notes*, I was not able to refer the idea to an earlier source than Prudentius. I should have done better to turn to Gregory the Great, or rather to the 24th chapter of Ezekiel. The passage in Gregory is (Migne 77. 71) :

‘Hinc rursum scriptum est [Ezek. 24. 12] : “Multo labore sudatum est, et non exivit de ea nimia rubigo ejus, neque per ignem.” Ignem quippe nobis tribulationis admovet, ut in nobis rubiginem vitiorum purget ; sed nec per ignem rubiginem amittimus, quando et inter flagella vitio non caremus.’

The passage from Gregory is thus translated by Alfred (Sweet’s ed., 269. 11–17) :

‘Bi ðæm ilcan is eft āwriten : “Ðær wæs suīðe suīðlic gesuīne, and ðær wæs micel swāt āgoten, and ðeah ne meahste monn him of āniman ðone miclan rūst, ne furðum mid fýre ne meahste hiene mon āweg āðon.” Hē ūs stiereð mid fýres broce, forðeāme hē wolde from ūs āðon ðone rūst ūrra unðeāwa, ac wē ðeah for ðæm broce ðæs fýres nyllað āketan from ūs ðæt rūst ðara unnytttra weorca, ðonne wē on ðære suingellan nyllað gebēt-an ūre unðeawas.’

Ezekiel begins the use of the word in 24. 6 : ‘Væ civitati sanguinum, ollæ cujus rubigo in ea est, et rubigo ejus non exivit de ea’ ; and continues it in 24. 11, leading up to the verse quoted by Gregory : ‘Pone quoque eam super prunas vacuam, ut incalescat, et liquefiat æs ejus ; et conflatur in medio ejus inquinamentum ejus, et consumatur rubigo ejus.’

Jerome, in his commentary on Ezekiel (Migne 25. 226), makes *rubigo* = *malitia*.

It appears from the foregoing that my conjecture that *rubigo*, rather than *ærugo*, underlies Cynewulf’s word, is corroborated by the verses in Ezekiel, and their interpretation by Latin commentators.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

SOME NOTES ON *La Constante Amarilis* OF CHRISTOVAL SUAREZ DE FIGUEROA.

The pastoral romances were received with great favour in Spain in the latter part of the sixteenth and early part of the seventeenth century. Many illustrious poets, among them Cervantes and Lope de Vega, followed in the footsteps of the Portuguese Jorge de Montemayor, who had introduced this new form of literature into Spain. Suarez de Figueroa’s pastoral romance, *La Constante Amarilis*, was published at Valencia, 1609, and the *Aprobacion* was signed August 1, of that year. Figueroa himself did not seem to think highly of his work, but it was praised by Cervantes in the *Viaje del Parnaso* :

“Figueroa estotro, el Doctorado,
Que cantó de Amarili la Constancia
En dulce prosa, y verso regalado.”¹

In 1614 a French translation of the *Constante Amarilis* by N. Lancelot, was printed at Lyon.

According to our eyes, the pastoral romances have many faults. We complain of their artificiality and of their incongruities, just as the authors themselves must have done, for no one laughed at them more heartily than Cervantes, in his *Coloquio de los Perros*. However, in Spain, the pastoral romances served a capital purpose, they allowed the poet to celebrate his patron or his friends with enough disguise to prevent the flattery from being too apparent. Montemayor is the protagonist of his *Diana*,² under the name of Sireno, and Lope de Vega tells us that Diana was a lady of Valencia de Don Juan.³ Cervantes followed suit and introduced some of his friends as shepherds in the *Galatea*. Lope de Vega celebrated the young Duke Antonio de Alba

¹ According to Barrera, *Nueva Biografía de Lope de Vega*, p. 307, Figueroa is the “*forte calvo cuidam, tuberosi admodum vultus*” mentioned in the *Expostulatio Spongie*. It is interesting as giving us the only hint we have of the personal appearance of our author. Clemencin, note to *Don Quixote*, vol. VI, p. 441, conjectured that the *Amarilis* of Figueroa was, perhaps, the actress Maria de Cordoba, merely from the fact, I presume, that the actress was generally known under the name of *Amarilis*.

² Ticknor, *Historia de la literatura española*. Sp. translation, Vol. III, p. 277.

³ *Dorotea*, Act II, scene ii ; Ticknor, *idem*.

as Anfriso in his *Arcadia*, and he himself appeared as Belardo, a poetical name he had assumed at the beginning of his career.⁴ In introducing well-known personages into his story, Figueroa merely followed tradition.

He tells us the history of the composition of the *Constante Amarilis* in his *Passagero*, which appeared in 1617.⁵ He says that some years before, a friend had come to him and begged him to celebrate the beauty and constancy of his sweetheart in a pastoral romance like the *Galatea* or *Arcadia*. The lover was so persistent that Figueroa was obliged to accept the task, which was not at all congenial to him. He was forced to work rapidly, for the lover constantly annoyed him and urged him to finish the story as soon as possible. In two months the book was completed, though the author was far from satisfied with it, owing to the haste with which it had been written.

In the prologue to the reader,⁶ Figueroa tells us his intention was to celebrate the constancy and suffering of two persecuted lovers, from the beginning of their lives until their happy marriage. In his dedication of the book to D. Vincencio Guerrero, Marques de Montebelo, he says: "These discourses contain a recent story of such worthy love, that the most ardent lovers can learn from it to attain what they desire by long suffering."

The outline of the story of the *Constante Amarilis* is quite simple. Damon, a shepherd from the banks of the Pisuerga, comes to a fair and spacious plain, three leagues from Madrid, where the shepherds and shepherdesses under the leadership of Menandro, devote themselves to rustic life and more particularly to love-making. Damon is kindly received by Menandro, who promises to take him under his protection and who tells him the sad story of his love affairs. He had fallen passionately in love with his cousin Amarilis, who was shut up in a convent, and they had promised to marry each other. However, the match was bitterly opposed by the family of Amarilis; the affair was brought to the King's attention and both Menandro and Amarilis were kept in con-

finement. Near the end of the book, we are told that Menandro's wedding would soon be celebrated, for a dispensation had been received from the Pope, allowing the cousins to marry. We have here all the elements of a romantic love story; namely, abduction of a girl from a convent, consequent disgrace, King's displeasure, blood relationship makes union still more difficult, and then the *deus ex machina* appears to untie the knot, a dispensation from the Pope arrives. This looks like pure fiction, but as we shall see, it is an absolutely true story.

The marriage celebrated by Figueroa in *La Constante Amarilis* was that of D. Juan Andrés Hurtado de Mendoza with doña María de Cardenas, daughter of D. Bernardino de Cardenas, Duque de Maqueda, and of doña Luisa Manrique de Lara, Duquesa de Nágera. Both parties belonged to the highest nobility of Spain. D. Juan Andrés de Mendoza was a son of D. García Hurtado de Mendoza, fourth Marqués de Cañete, whose heroic deeds in Chile are told in Ercilla's *Araucana*,⁷ Pedro de Oña's *Araucó Domado* and in other epic poems and dramas. When his love-affair with Doña María de Cardenas (*Amarilis*) took place, D. Juan Andrés was about forty-three years old, and had already been twice married, the first time to doña María Pacheco, by which marriage he had a son, D. García de Mendoza, and the second time to doña María de la Cerda.⁸ Our sources of information in regard to the love-affair of Menandro and Amarilis are Cabrera de Córdoba's *Relaciones* and Figueroa's life of D. García de Mendoza, the father of D. Juan Andrés. These accounts agree so closely with the story as told in *La Constante Amarilis* that there can be no doubt as to the identity of the leading characters.

⁷ The heroic deeds of the Marquis de Cañete are told in the *Araucana*, it is true, but the name of the Marquis is rarely mentioned. The lukewarmness of Ercilla is due to the harsh and unjust manner in which he was treated by the Marquis. Indeed, the objections which Suarez de Figueroa found to the *Araucana* were: 1) "que calló a D. Garcia Hurtado de Mendoza en su *Araucana*; 2) que este silencio pracedió de la ingratitude de su ánimo, obligado por otra parte de muchos favores, que habia recibido de su mano; 3) que su historia quedó como apócrifa." See the introduction to the ed. of the *Araucana*, Madrid, 1781, vol. I, p. xxi.

⁸ Lopez de Haro, *Nobiliario*, II, p. 353.

⁴ H. A. Rennert, *Life of Lope de Vega*, p. 102, also *Spanish Pastoral Romances*, Baltimore, 1892, p. 70, note.

⁵ *El Passagero*, Madrid, 1617, fol. 96-97 b.

⁶ The references are to the edition of Madrid, 1781.

Damon, the shepherd from the banks of the Pisuerga, is Figueroa himself.⁹ On page 19 of the *Constante Amarilis*, we are told that Menandro loved with firm intention and promise of marriage, the peerless Amarilis. Cabrera de Córdoba, in his delightful *Relaciones*, in a letter dated Madrid, September 29, 1607, gives us our first information about this third matrimonial venture of D. Juan Andrés de Mendoza :

"Ha sucedido que la duquesa de Nájera tenía su hija mayor Doña María en un Monasterio de Torrijos, y por algunos medios que hubo don Hurtado, hijo del Marqués de Cañete, fué allá, y delante de un escribano se decían palabra de casarse, y poder para traer dispensacion para efectuarlo.¹⁰ Esto llegó á la noticia de la Duquesa, que lo tomó con mucho sentimiento, y prendieron á don Hurtado y le tienen con dos guardas en casa de un alcalde de Corte, y enviaron otro alcalde al monasterio para que guardase á la dicha doña María, que nadie la hable ni la pueda dar ni recibir de ella recaudos ni dádivas, y se puso pena á la Duquesa y al Duque su hijo para que no puedan ir allá. Dícese que la Duquesa mostraba poca voluntad á la hija y quería que fuese religiosa, y por no quererlo ser, la trataba con aspereza, y no le daba lo que habia menester, y fué necesario acudir al consejo para que la mandase dar alimentos; y este rigor ha sido causa de lo que ha sucedido y querer la Duquesa casar otra hija menor con grande dote; y ha mandado S. M. que no se escriba sobre este negocio, lo que hace creer tendrá efecto el casamiento."¹¹

Figueroa also tells of this proposed marriage :

"Mientras atendía a esto, se le recreció una ocasion de gravissimo cuidado. Esto fué el tratado casamiento de su mayorazgo con Doña María de Cardenas, hija de los Duques de Maqueda y Nájera. Hizieronse de la otra parte para impedirle las diligencias posibles, (por tener ya de otro matrimonio hijo varon sucesor de su casa y estado), no solo en España con su Magestad, sino en Roma con el Pontífice, de quien pendía la dispensacion del parentesco que avía entre los dos."¹²

⁹ He was born at Valladolid, which is situated on the river Pisuerga.

¹⁰ This was necessary because they were cousins.

¹¹ *Relaciones de los cosas sucedidas en España, 1599-1614*, p. 316.

¹² *Hechos de Don Garcia Hurtado de Mendoza*, Madrid, 1613, p. 322.

If we examine the story which Menandro related to Damon, in the *Constante Amarilis*, we find that it corresponds closely to the above. He says he formerly took pleasure in entertaining with music and celebrating in verse, the fair shepherdesses of the Manzanares, but never was his heart touched by love—a rather remarkable statement when we remember that he had already been twice married, and had a son. He continues : "Passing from one village to another, I happened to hear of the beauty and perfection of my cousin Amarilis. In strict confinement, owing to the wishes of her family, she was honoring a small place, etc."¹³ He determined to go and see her and his joy and delight knew no bounds when he could "pelar la pava" at her window. "I went to see her frequently, but the novelty and conversation of the guest caused some disturbance in the neighbouring farm houses, so the last time, hastening our intentions, we solemnly promised each other the faith of man and wife, and thereupon, the sun which nourished my life, was hidden."¹⁴ Cabrera de Córdoba says that don Hurtado went to the convent at Torrijos, where doña María de Cardenas was confined, and before a notary, they mutually made a promise of marriage.

Menandro continues : "Finally, when the affair was known, her relatives, for certain reasons, began to destroy the marriage bond, asking our supreme shepherd (the King) to proceed against me with all severity, for what I had attempted."¹⁵ They were both put in confinement and he tells Damon that the moon has sixteen times shown its face full since his troubles began.¹⁶ Cabrera de Córdoba's account of the discovery of their relations is dated September 29, 1607, and the action of the *Constante Amarilis* is supposed to take place after a lapse of sixteen months or about March, 1609. This corresponds to the date March 29, 1609, given by Figueroa in

¹³ Ed. 1781, p. 33, *ibid.* According to Cabrera de Córdoba, *Relaciones*, p. 316, this "small place" was Torrijos. It is a small town near Toledo, and from the beginning of the sixteenth century belonged to the Dukes of Maqueda.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 36.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

*Hechos de Don García de Mendoza*¹⁷ as the date of the marriage of Juan Hurtado with his cousin. We have already seen that Cabrera de Córdoba speaks of the hostility of doña María's family to the match and says that when their love was discovered, both parties were kept closely guarded, while the lady's family appealed to the King for aid.

Near the close of the *Constante Amarilis*,¹⁸ we read that Menandro's troubles are about at an end. "In the meantime, the father of Menandro, a famous shepherd, whose valiant sword penetrated with rare glory the two extremes of the world,¹⁹ petitioned the Supreme Priest (the Pope) to remove the bar of relationship which hindered the happy marriage of Menandro and Amarilis, and after some difficulty, so just a petition was granted." The Temporal Power (the King) had to yield to the Spiritual Power (the Pope) and so the confinement of the lovers ceased and their marriage was expected without delay.²⁰ Great was the joy of Menandro and Amarilis when they saw an end to their misfortunes, and then followed the congratulations and the visits of relatives and of those in Menandro's service.

Cabrera de Córdoba in a letter dated Madrid, April 11, 1609, gives the following account of the marriage :

"El casamiento de don Hurtado, hijo del Marqués de Cañete, se hizo en Barajas,²¹ asistiendo los de la casa de Lemos como deudos, con la hija de la Duquesa de Nájera ; aunque la madre lo ha procurado impedir y contradecir la dispensacion, y cuando no ha podido mas, en lugar de librea, ha dado á sus criados luto, y se ha mandado á los casados se vayan á residir en Argete, lugar del Marqués, hasta ver si se pueden reducir en la gracia de la Duquesa." ²²

The account given by Figueroa in his life of Don García de Mendoza²³ is substantially the same.

La Constante Amarilis is filled with lavish praise of Figueroa's patron, and contains many veiled allusions to the great deeds of D. Juan Hurtado's father. By means of a dream, he

tells of the heroic achievements of Menandro's noble ancestors against the Araucanians :

"Fueron, vieron y vencieron ; alcanzando en diferentes batallas gloriosos trofeos, fixando el estandarte de Austria en los encumbrados cerros jamas domados, y poniendo con heroica virtud, los invencibles plantas sobre los essentas cervices." ²⁴

These allusions to Don García de Mendoza serve to strengthen the identity between Menandro and Don Juan Hurtado de Mendoza. Besides, we know that this nobleman was for a number of years a patron of Figueroa, for he dedicated to him the first edition (1612) of his epic, *España Defendida*, and the Madrid edition (1616) of the *Hechos de Don García de Mendoza*.

J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD.

University of Pennsylvania.

MACBETH'S "unmannerly breech'd with gore."

In Macbeth, II, iii. 122 :

their daggers
Unmannerly breech'd with gore,

the interpretation of *breech'd* that appears now to be most commonly accepted is, 'covered as with breeches.' This is the meaning assigned to the word in this passage in the *Oxford Dictionary*, but neither there nor, so far as I know, by any editor of Shakespeare, is an example cited of a similar use by any other writer, or in any other passage of Shakespeare. It is generally held that Shakespeare invented the metaphor for this special passage, as in keeping with the strained language of Macbeth throughout the speech. That Shakespeare did not here invent a new use of the word will, I think, be clear from the following passage in "*The ciule Conuersation* of M. Stephan Guazzo . . . the first three [books] translated out of French by G. pettie [the fourth out of the Italian by Bartholomew Young], London, Thomas East, 1586" (it is as well to give the context in full) :

¹⁷ Ed. Madrid, 1613, p. 321.

¹⁸ P. 277.

¹⁹ This praise is due to Don García's victories over the Araucanians in Chile and his viceroyship in Peru.

²⁰ *La Constante Amarilis*, p. 278.

²¹ Barajas is a small town in the province of Cuenca.

²² *Relaciones*, p. 367.

²³ *Hechos*, p. 321.

²⁴ *Constante Amarilis*, pp. 125-126.

... "And therefore though solitarinesse be agreeable to melancholik persons, yet it is unpleasant to all other, which you shall better understand, if you marke how some women with child long to eate things which all other folke abhorre: and yet for all that we must not saie that such meates are conuenient, for though they please some women, yet commonlie they are displeasing to all. And when the melancholike person, & the woman with childe shall be rid, the one of his false imagination, & the other of her altered taste, they will haue in hate the things aboue said.

GUAZ. You make me now doubt least I be in worse case than I am aware of: for you meane by your wordes to include mee in the number of the melancholike, which haue their wit so *breeched*, that they cannot discerne sweete from sowre. But if I flatter not my selfe, I haue a whole minde within my erasie bodie, and my pleasure is common to other men of good taste." Fol. 4, rect., lines 3-19.

In "*La Civile Conversation* . . . Traduite de l'Italien du S. Estienne Guazzo . . . par Gabriel Chappuys Tourangeau, Lyon, par Iean Beraud, 1580," from which Pettie's version was doubtless made, we find:

"Vous me faites maintenant douter, que ie ne sois en pire estat que ie ne me sens: car vous voulez dire & inferer que ie sois du nombre des melancoliques, lesquels ont tellement, le cerueau *obfusqué*, qu'ils ne scauroient discerner le doux d'auec l'amer:"

obfusqué answers to *offuscato* of the Italian of Guazzo, which is defined by Florio (*World of Wordes*, 1598, s. v., 'offuscare'), 'to darken, obscure, blind, dazzle, eclipse, shadow, dim.'

From this I think it is pretty clear that *breech* was more or less current (perhaps current only as an affectation) in the sense of 'cover over,' (of the mind, 'becloud') the original sense being, no doubt, 'cover as with breeches.' The passage from Pettie's translation, therefore, confirms the usual interpretation to the extent that Macbeth means "covered with gore," but disposes of the assumption that Shakespeare invents a fantastic metaphor for the occasion. It may be that he makes Macbeth use an affected expression.

It may be mentioned that Miss M. A. Scott (*Pub. Mod. Lang. Assn.*, xiv, 543) states that she has been unable to learn anything of the French original of Pettie. The copy from which I have made the citation is in the Bodleian

library, Oxford. There is no copy in the British Museum.

L. M. HARRIS.

The College of Charleston.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE.

(Continued: See Vol. xx, p. 239.)

3293. The diss. contains 34 pages; the complete work (Weimar, 1897), xii + 181. The review references should have been added (Koepfel is in *E. St.*, xxiv. 108-118; for Ritter I have searched long but in vain). Cp. also *M. L. N.*, xv. 159-160.

3297 a. Enter here no. 3307, Schömbbs, which appeared in 1898.

3305 a. Add: F. J. Mather, Jr., ed.—The Prologue, The Knight's Tale, and The Nun's Priest's Tale (Boston, 1899).

3307. Read: Schömbbs.

3307 a. Add: Schömbbs, J.—Orlando furioso in der englischen Litteratur. (In *E. St.*, xxvi. 456-457, 1899.)

3311 a. Add: Axon, W. E. A.—Italian Influence on Chaucer. (In Chaucer Memorial Lectures, pp. 83-110, 1900.)

3315 a. Add: Fränkel, L.—Romanische, insbesondere italienische Wechselbeziehungen zur englischen Literatur. (In *Krit. Jahresb.*, iv. 2, 440-549, 1900.)

3317 a. Add: Koch, J.—Chaucer's italienische Periode. (In *E. St.*, xxvii, 1-4, 1900.)

3319. Cp. no. 3286.

3332 a. Add: Bond, R. W.—Note on Italian Influence in Lyly's Plays. (In his Complete Works of John Lyly, ii. 473-485, 1902.)

3571. For xviii. read xvii. Add rev. by R. Beer in *Anz. d. Alt.*, xxvi. 134-161.

3605 a. Enter here the first instalment of Stiefel (no. 3615), 1890.

3613. Enter as no. 3610 a. Appeared in 1894.

3614 a. Add: Koepfel, E.—Quellen-Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's (Strassburg, 1897; Quellen u. Forsch., lxxxii; rev. by R. Boyle

in *E. St.*, xxv. 289-297; by J. Lecoq in *Rev. Crit.*, n. s. xliii. 509-510).

3617 a. Add: Koeppel, E.—The Prince of the Burning Crowne und Palmerin d'Oлива. (In *Archiv*, c. 23-30, 1898.)

3624 a. Add: Wiener, L.—Spanish Studies in England in the 16th and 17th Centuries. (In *M. L. Q.*, ii. 5, 3-10, 1899.)

3625 a. Add: Becker, G.—Die Aufnahme des Don Quijote in die englische Litteratur (1605 bis c. 1770) (Diss., Berlin, 1902).

3628 a. Add: Reade, H.—How did Calderon Know Shakespeare's Plays? (In *Westm. Rev.*, July, 1903, clx. 84-88.)

3628 b. Add: Rosenbach, A. S. W.—The Influence of the "Celestina" in the Early English Drama (Univ. of Pennsylvania diss.; *Shakesp.-Jb.*, xxxix. 43-61, 1903).

3750 a. Add: Stefánsson, J.—How Browning Strikes a Scandinavian. (In *Browning Soc. Papers*, iii. 115-123, 1891.)

3750 b. Add: Stefánsson, J.—Oldnordisk Indvirkning på engelsk Litteratur i det 8. og 9. Årh. (*Nord. Tidskr. f. Vetensk.*, etc., pp. 489-503, 1891.)

3751, l. 3. Read for xviii: xvii.

3799 a. Add: Kölbing, E.—Romanische Einflüsse auf die nordische und englische Litteratur des Mittelalters, 1891-94. (In *Krit. Jahresb.*, iv. 2, pp. 427-437, 1899.) Cp. no. 3744.

3835 a. Add: Farley, F. E.—Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement (Boston, 1903; *Stud. and Notes in Philol. and Lit.*, ix; rev. by E. Koeppel in *E. St.*, xxxiv. 397-402).

3838 a. An appendix on linguistic studies should include Flom, G. T., Scandinavian Influence on Southern Lowland Scotch (New York, 1900); Björkman, E., Scandinavian Loan-Words in Middle English (Halle, 1900-2); and many other titles.

4043 a. Add: An.—Lord Byrons Beziehungen zu Amerika. (In *Allgemeine Zeitung*, Beilage, pp. 58 ff., 1897.)

4044 a. Add: Van Nüys, F.—The Spirit of Tennyson's and Longfellow's Poetry Compared. (In *University of Virginia Magazine*, May, 1897.)

4054. Continued in same, Jan., 1902.

4058, l. 2. Read: elementary.

4099 a. Add: Varnhagen, H.—Longfellow's Tales of a Wayside Inn und ihre Quellen nebst Nachweisen und Untersuchungen über die vom Dichter bearbeiteten Stoffe (Berlin, 1884).

4146 a. Add: Kratz, F.—Das deutsche Element in den Werken H. W. Longfellow's, i. (Progr. Wasserburg, 1901). Cp. no. 4152.

4163 a. Enter here also no. 2460 a.

4193 a. Add: Smith, C. A.—Finnish Influence: Repetition in Hiawatha and Other Finnish Imitations. (In his *Repetition and Parallelism in English Verse*, pp. 38-43, 1894.)

4301 a. Add: Remy, A. J. F.—The Influence of India and Persia on the Poetry of Germany (New York, 1901).

4312 a. Add: Behn-Eschenberg, H.—Die Wechselwirkungen der englischen und der festländischen Literatur vor der Zeitalter Shakspeare's (Zürich, 1865).

4331 a. Add: Fränkel, L.—Zur Geschichte von Shakespeare's Bekanntwerden in den Niederlanden. (In *E. St.*, xv. 155-159, 1891.)

4339 a. Add: Moolhuizen, J. J.—Vondels Lucifer in Miltons Verloren Paradijs: kritisch onderzoek ('s-Gravenhage, 1895).

4345 a. Add: Nicholson, R. A.—The Arthurian Legend: a Persian Parallel. (In *Athen.*, 1901, i. 434.)

4346 a. Add: Hoog, W. de—Studiën Over de Nederlandsche en Engelsche taal en letterkunde en haar wederzijdschen invloed (Dordrecht, 1902-3).

4347 a. Enter here also no. 2461.

4520 a. Add: Rigault, A. H.—Histoire de la querelle des anciens et des modernes (Thèse, Paris, 1856; same in his *Oeuvres complètes*, i. 1859).

4744 a. Add: Beaussire, É.—De summi apud Britannos poetæ tragœdiis e Plutarcho ductis (Thesis, Grenoble, 1855).

4747 a. Add: Arnold, M.—On Translating Homer (London, 1861).

4749 a. Add: Arnold, M.—On Translating Homer: Last Words (London, 1862).

4755 a. Add: Stapfer, P.—Qualis sapientiae antiquae laudator, qualis interpres Franciscus Baconus exstiterit (Thesis, Paris, 1870).

4766 a. Add: Rawnsley, H. D.—Virgil and Tennyson (In *Macm. Mag.*, xxxiii. 43-49, 1875. Same in *Lit. Liv. Age*, ccxxvii. 756-762, and in *Memories of the Tennysons*, 1900, pp. 201-220).

4774. Also trans. into English by Emily J. Carey (London, 1880).
- 4778 a. Add: Bock, W.—Zur Destruction of Troy, eine Sprach- und Quellenuntersuchung (Diss., Halle, 1883).
- 4796 a. Add: Kittredge, G. L.—Chaucer and Maximianus. (In *Am. J. Ph.*, ix. 84–85, 1888.)
- 4804 a. Add: Koepfel, E.—Chauceriana, i, ii. (In *Anglia*, xiii. 174–183, 1890.)
- 4805 a. Add: Collins, J. C.—Illustrations of Tennyson (London, 1891; 2d ed. 1902).
- 4805 b. Add: Cook, A. S.—The Literary Genealogy of Ulysses. (In *Poet-Lore*, iii. 499–504, 1891.)
- 4805 c. Add: Guild, Edward C.—A List of Poems Illustrating Greek Mythology in the English Poetry of the Nineteenth Century. (In Bowdoin College Library Bulletin, no. 1, June, 1891, pp. 16.)
- 4805 d. Add: Moulton, R. G.—Balaustion's Adventure as a Beautiful Misrepresentation of the Original. (In Browning Soc. Papers, iii. 148–167, 1891.)
- 4807 a. Add: Lounsbury, T. R.—Studies in Chaucer, His Life and Writings (Boston, 1892). Chap. v, The Learning of Chaucer.
4810. Read: Whibley.
- 4815 a. Enter here also no. 5868, Gayley (appeared in 1893).
- 4817 a. Add: Paul, H.—Tennyson's Classical Poems. (In *19th Cent.*, March, 1893, xxxiii. 436–453: same in *Lit. Liv. Age*, cxvii. 407–418, and in Men and Letters, pp. 1–26, London, 1901.)
- 4819 a. Add: Holthausen, F.—Chaucer und Theodulus. (In *Anglia*, xvi. 264–266, 1894.)
- 4822 a. Add: Flügel, E.—Ueber einige Stellen aus dem Almagestum Cl. Ptolemei bei Chaucer und im Rosenroman. (In *Anglia*, xviii. 133–140, 1895.)
4823. The reference is wrong. Read: *Acad.*, Mar. 16, 1895.
- 4828 a. Add: Lawton, W. C.—The Classical Element in Browning's Poetry. (In *Am. J. Ph.*, xvii. 197 ff., 1896. Also in Boston Browning Soc. Papers, pp. 363–388, 1897.)
- 4828 b. Add: Sawtelle, A. E.—The Sources of Spenser's Classical Mythology (New York, 1896).
- 4829 a. Add: Boll, F.—Chaucer und Ptolemaeus. (In *Anglia*, xxi. 222–230, 1898.)
- 4829 b. Add: Goodenough, M. L.—Bacon and Plutarch. (In *M. L. N.*, xii. 142–146, 1897.)
- 4829 c. Add: Liddell, M.—One of Chaucer's Sources [Boethius]. (In *Nation*, lxiv. 124–125, 1897.)
- 4829 d. Add: Mather, F. J., Jr.—On Chaucer's Cleopatra and Her Pit of Serpents. (In *Nation*, lxvii. 331–332, 1898.)
- 4829 e. Add: Mustard, W. P.—Tennyson and Catullus. (In *Nation*, lxvi. 362–363, 1898.)
- 4829 f. Add: Mustard, W. P.—Tennyson and Horace. (In *Nation*, lxvi. 438–439, 1898.)
- 4829 g. Add: Scudder, Vida D.—The Greek Spirit in Shelley and Browning. (In Boston Browning Soc. Papers, pp. 438–470, 1897.)
4830. Appeared in complete form in 1899 (*Münchener Beitr.*, xvi).
- 4832 a. Add: Allen, K.—Lucretius the Poet, and Tennyson's Poem 'Lucretius.' (In *Poet-Lore*, xi. 529–548, 1899.)
- 4832 b. Add: Bowen, E. W.—Shelley and Catullus. (In *Sewanee Rev.*, vii. 337, 1899.)
- 4832 c. Add: Boyle, R.—Shakespeare and Ovid. (In *E. St.*, xxvii. 323, 1899.)
4834. Read: Smyth. Appeared in 1898; enter as no. 4830 a.
- 4834 a. Add: Anders, H. R. D.—Shakespeare's Belesenheit (Diss., Berlin, 1900; amplified in 1904 as Shakespeare's Books).
- 4839 a. Add: Haight, Elizabeth H.—Tennyson's Use of Homeric Material. (In *Poet-Lore*, xii. 541–556, 1900.)
- 4847 a. Add: Koepfel, E.—Spensers Florimell und die Britomartis-Sage des Antoninus Liberalis. (In *Archiv*, cvii. 394–396, 1901.)
- 4851 a. Add: Bushnell, C. C.—A Parallelism between Lucan and Lines in Tintern Abbey. (In *J. G. Ph.*, iv. 58, 1902.)
- 4854 a. Add: Mustard, W. P.—Homeric Echoes in Matthew Arnold's 'Balder Dead.' (In Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, pp. 19–28, 1902.)
- 4856 a. Add: Stevenson, W. H.—Chaucer and Theodolus. (In *Athen.*, 1902, i. 338.)
- 4859 a. Add: Gilde, J. A. A.—Die dramatische Behandlung der Rückkehr des Odysseus bei

Nicholas Rowe, Robert Bridges und Stephen Phillips (Diss., Königsberg, 1903).

4862 a. Add: Root, R. K.—Classical Mythology in Shakespeare (New York, 1903).

5222 a. Add: Reed, H.—Lectures on English History and Tragic Poetry as Illustrated by Shakespeare (Philadelphia, 1856).

5300 a. Add: Möller, G. H.—Die Auffassung der Kleopatra in der Tragödienliteratur der romanischen und germanischen Nationen (Ulm, 1888; rev. by Sachs in *Lb. g. r. Ph.*, x, 262-263).

5350 a. Add: Darmesteter, J.—The French Revolution and Wordsworth. (In his *English Studies*, trans. Mary Darmesteter, 1896.)

5360. Continued in same, xcix. 59-76, 327-38, c. 131-52.

5368 a. Add: Tyler, M. C.—The Literary History of the American Revolution (New York, 1897-98).

5550 a. Add: Conway, M. D.—The Wandering Jew (London, 1881).

5584 a. Add: Rees, J.—Shakespeare and the Bible (Philadelphia, 1876).

5605 a. Add: Batiouchkof, T.—Spor dushi s tielom. (In *Journal of the Minister of Public Instruction* [Russian], St. Petersburg, Sept., 1890-Aug., 1891; also reprinted in book form, 1891, and in part translated in *Romania*, xx, 1-55, 513-578, 1891.)

5605 b. Add: Bruce, J. D.—A Contribution to the Study of "The Body and the Soul:" Poems in English. (In *M. L. N.*, v, 193-201, 1890.) Of this subject, on which Betz's list includes no entries, a separate bibliography has been compiled and will appear soon.

5625 a. Add: Kuhn, E.—Barlaam und Joasaph: eine bibliographisch-literargeschichtliche Studie. (In *Abhandlungen d. kgl. bay. Akad.*, Philos.-philol. Cl., xx, 1-88, 1894. Additions by F. de Haan in *M. L. N.*, x, 11-17, 69-73.)

5657 a. Add: Cook, A. S.—Biblical Quotations in Old English Prose Writers (London, 1898-1903).

5671. Read: Cushman.

5673 a. Add: Krapp, G. P.—The Legend of Saint Patrick's Purgatory: Its Later Literary History (Diss., Johns Hopkins; Baltimore, 1900).

5692 a. Add: Machen, Minnie G.—The Bible

in Browning with Particular Reference to The Ring and the Book (New York, 1903).

5746 a. Add: Axon, W. E. A.—The Legend of the Disguised Knight. (In *Trans. Roy. Soc. of Lit.*, 2d ser., ix, 440-475, 1870.)

5793 a. Add: Koeppel, E.—Lydgate's Story of Thebes: eine Quellenuntersuchung (Diss., München, 1884; rev. by A. Brandl in *Lb. g. r. Ph.*, vi, 284-285.)

5863. Read: Schofield.

5868. Appeared in 1893. Enter as no. 5857 a.

5896 a. Add: Sarrazin, G.—Germanische Heldensage in Shaksperes Titus Andronicus. (In *Archiv*, xcvi, 373-375, 1896.)

5897 a. Add: Axon, W. E. A.—The Story of the Substituted Bride. (In *N. Q.*, 8th ser., xii, 323-324, 1897.)

5911 a. Add: Fastenrath.—Die Don Juan-Sage in Spanien und in der Weltliteratur (preface to his trans. of Zorrilla's Don Juan Tenorio, Dresden, 1898).

5939 a. Add: Nutt, A. T.—The Fairy Mythology of Shakespeare. (London, 1900.)

5957 a. Add: Kühne, W.—Venus, Amor und Bacchus in Shakespeare's Dramen: eine medicinisch-poetische Studie (Braunschweig, 1902).

5968 a. Add: Perrett, W.—The Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare (Diss., Jena; Weimar, 1903).

In conclusion it may be remarked that a bibliography of "The Celtic Influence in Literature" (cp. Baldensperger in *Rev. Crit.*, n. s. l. 93) remains a desideratum; and that we hope before long to publish a collection of titles which may serve at least as a nucleus for such a bibliography.

CLARK S. NORTHUP.

Cornell University.

ARNOLD'S SOURCES FOR *Sohrab and Rustum*.

It is generally assumed, either explicitly or by inference,¹ that Matthew Arnold's *Sohrab and*

¹Cf. editions of *Sohrab and Rustum* by G. A. Watrous, p. 101, etc.; L. M. Hodgkins, p. 120; J. C. Castleman, p. 149, etc.

Rustum (1853) is based on the story as told in the abridgment of the *Sháhnáma* of Firdawsí by the Rev. J. A. Atkinson² (1832), which gives in an appendix a complete rendering of the Sohrab and Rustum episode in heroic couplets; or on Sir John Malcolm's³ *History of Persia*⁴ (1815); but no one has investigated the relative use made of the two, or the exact debt of the poet to either. The *Sháhnáma* has since been made accessible, in complete form, in the French translation of J. Mohl (1876-78) and in the German translation by Rückert (Berlin, 1890-95), and portions of it in the abridged versions of A. F. von Shack (Stuttgart, 1877), and Miss H. Zimmermann (1883). Arnold might well have known Atkinson's epitome, published a good many years before he composed his poem, and the general impression seems to be that it was his principal source for the story of the poem. Many editors of *Sohrab and Rustum* make no reference at all to the *History of Persia* of Sir John Malcolm, contenting themselves with citing Atkinson's book.

To the present writer it seems that Malcolm's *History* was the chief basis for Arnold's narrative. The poet's familiarity with it is evident from the fact that it is the short sketch, from the latter, of the episode of Sohrab and Rustum that is included in the notes illustrative or explanatory of Arnold's *Poems*,⁵ in the complete edition published during his lifetime. No similar reference is made to the *Sháhnáma* or to Atkinson. But this, in itself, need not mean much. In his *Letters*, Arnold has little to say about the composition of his poem, and nothing about his sources for the story. In the absence of direct external testimony, internal testimony must be sought by those interested in the question of where Arnold found his materials.

The results given by a short comparison of the three accounts may be briefly summarized.

(1). In general, great variety, if not inconsistency, prevails in the English rendering of Persian names, whether proper names or place-

names; but in his choice of name-forms Arnold seems to follow Malcolm quite faithfully, making few departures or modifications. For example, Malcolm has Peeran-Wisa,⁶ *hyphenated* (I, 30), Zoarrah (I, 28), Ferood (I, 34), Gudurz (I, 35), Haman (I, 28), Feriburz (I, 33), Seistan (I, 34), etc. Arnold has Peran-Wisa, *hyphenated*, Zoarrah, Ferood, Gudurz, Haman, Feraburz, Seistan. Atkinson, on the other hand, has Píran-Wisah, *unhyphenated*, Zúára, Férhad, Gúdarz, Húmán, Fraburz, Sístan, etc. Afrasiab is king of the "Tartars" with Malcolm (I, 39, etc.) and with Arnold; of the "Turanians" with Atkinson.

(2). In Arnold's poem, Sohrab proves his identity by revealing Rustum's seal pricked on his arm, whereas in the *Sháhnáma*, Atkinson's translation, he reveals an amulet (pp. 124, 139, etc.) or a golden bracelet, bound on his arm (p. 402). Most editors,⁷ referring to this passage, assume that Arnold intentionally departed from the original story, and credit the change to the poet's art; but Malcolm's words here (I, 28) are:

"The afflicted and dying youth tore open his mail, and showed his father a seal which his mother had placed on his arm when she discovered to him the secret of his birth and bade him seek his father."

It would seem that Arnold was following or interpreting this abridged or inexact passage in Malcolm's account, not deliberately modifying Atkinson's.

(3). The name of Sohrab's mother, Tamineh, is not given in Malcolm's *History*, and is not mentioned in Arnold's poem in the passages referring to her, although they afford good opportunity. In the story in the *Sháhnáma*, she is very prominent, and, had the poet relied on the account of the episode as given by Atkinson, she would be as likely to be named as Zal, Rustum's father. Arnold gives Zal's name and story, but these are given (I, 17) by Malcolm.

(4). In Arnold's poem, the opposing armies are encamped by the Oxus—readers of the poem will remember how much is made of this—and it

²The edition cited here is the reprint in the *Chandos Classics* series (1886).

³Cf. editions of Arnold's poem by L. M. Guiney, p. 1; L. M. Hodgkins, p. 20, etc.

⁴References in this article are to the edition of 1829.

⁵Cf. the Macmillan edition (1883), I, 268.

⁶Described by Malcolm as the "Nestor of the Tartars," and pictured by Arnold with many touches that recall the Homeric sage.

⁷Watrous, p. 102; Hodgkins, p. 67; Seabury, p. 133, etc.

is here that the combat takes place. This might have been suggested by the reference to the Oxus in his sketch of the episode (I, 28) by Malcolm; in fact, this is the only scene for the episode which the latter suggests. The Oxus region stands out clearly in Malcolm's chapters as the frontier region defended by Rustum against the invading Tartars. In Atkinson's work (pp. 131-33, etc.) Sohrab is represented as in a fortress, Rustum as arriving before it; and the scene suggested is of quite different character. When the river is mentioned (p. 408), it is called the Jihún, and so throughout.

(5). A few references like that to Rustum's falcon (II, 199-203), the Bahrein diver (II, 284-9), Jemshid's pillars of black granite at Persepolis (II, 860-3), might possibly have been suggested by passages in Malcolm (II, 397; I, 540; II, 370), although it is possible also that the poet made them independently.

Perhaps it should be added that, of the two books, the *History of Persia* seems, in any case, the more attractive and clearer book for the poet's purpose. Atkinson's heroic couplets are not very good reading, and the story as given by him from Firdawsí, is relatively tedious, and complicated by the introduction of many personages and many details. Arnold's story is simple and clear cut, like Malcolm's, and there seems to be nothing in his materials that might not be based only on Malcolm's book. From the references given, it would seem that he turned to the first few chapters of Vol. I, the Appendix to this volume, and chapters XXII and XXIII (on the climate, manners, and usages of the Persians) in Vol. II.

If Arnold did make use of Atkinson's translation—an assumption that is not absolutely imperative, but which it is perhaps well to make—it was for stray touches in the handling; though here by far the strongest influences are the Homeric and the biblical. It might easily be that having found his story, incidents, allusions, and names, in Malcolm's *History*, he turned to the episode as told in fuller form in Atkinson's abridgment of Firdawsí. A number of similarities in the handling, perhaps fortuitous, perhaps otherwise, may be noticed between Arnold's poem and the verse account of Atkinson. Such are the

embassy of Gudarz, to Rustum, and the former's argument (cf. Atkinson, p. 131), the description of Sohrab, giving the "cypress tree" simile (*ib.* 132), touches in the dialogue where Sohrab and Rustum meet, or in the narrative of the combat, and so on. Most of these, however, are pointed out by various editors of the poem.

LOUISE POUND.

University of Nebraska.

NOTE ON MILTON'S *Comus*.

Milton's *Comus* in many ways presents singular analogies to Spenser's account of the adventures of Amoret in the palace of Busyrane, *Faerie Queene*, Book III, Cantos xi-xii.

1. The latter was without doubt in its original form the masque entitled *The Court of Cupid*, one of Spenser's lost poems mentioned in the dedication of the *Shepherd's Calendar*. Spenser, describing the scene within the palace, uses these words:—

After whom marched a jolly company,
In manner of a masque, enranked orderly.

2. The subjects of the two masques are identical—the triumph of chastity. In handling the subject, however, Milton is far more restrained than Spenser. The former has for his heroine the chaste lady, the sister of the two brothers; the latter the equally chaste Amoret, the bride of Sir Scudamour.

3. Both the palaces are of magic, the homes of dread enchanters who wage incessant warfare against virtue. Both are beautiful in their appeal to the sensuous eye, yet in both are found, "oughly-headed monsters, visored falsehood and base forgery."

4. Neither palace is to be entered with impunity. Scudamour finds the fire that burns before the door an effectual bar. Britomart, however, strong in the strength of her virginity, finds a ready entrance. The brothers in *Comus* dare not enter until they have received the counter-charm from the Attendant Spirit. Then they may,

Boldly assault the necromancer's hall.

5. In both the ladies are constrained in body. The lady in *Comus* is in a chair from which she may not rise. Amoret is suffering from a wound, and her hands

Were bounden fast, that did her ill become,
And her small waste girt round with yron bands
Upon a brasen pillour, by the which she stands.

And her before the vile Enchanter sate,
Figuring straunge characters of his arte :
And all perforce to make her him to love.

6. In each case the liberation is not complete without the aid of magic. "The brothers rush in with swords drawn, wrest his (Comus') glass out of his hand, break it against the ground ; his rout make sign of resistance, but all are driven in." But the maiden is not yet free.

Attendant Spirit.

What ! Have you let the false enchanter scape ?
O, ye mistook ! Ye should have snatched his wand,
And bound him fast. Without his rod reversed
And backward mutters of dis severing power,
We cannot free the lady that sits here
In stony fetters fixed and motionless.

The nymph Sabrina is called in to undo what Comus had done.

In the *Masque of Cupid*, Britomart would have slain the magician, Busyrane,

Had not the lady, which by him stood bound,
Dernly unto her called to abstain
From doing her to dy. For else her paine
Should be remedillesse ; sith none but he
Which wrought it could the same recure againe.

Busyrane mutters the charms backward, and Amoret, like the lady in *Comus*, is free.

P. M. BUCK, JR.

St. Louis, Mo.

THE *Ludus Coventriae*.

The readily available information concerning the cycle of miracle-plays most properly designated the *Ludus Coventriae*, is well summed up in Chambers' *Medieval Stage* (II, 416-22). The whole question, however, is still involved in such obscurity that a slightly different exposition of the cycle as it stands, and some new theories closely akin to guesses concerning its genesis, may be hazarded.

The *Ludus Coventriae* was divided for presentation into two parts : the first twenty-eight plays given one year, the remaining fourteen the next. This is deduced from the words of *Contemplacio* (XXIX) :

We intendyn to procede the matere that we lefte the last yere.

Furthermore, the plays of the first part subdivide into four more or less clearly defined groups. The seven plays at the outset, handling Old Testament stories, form a series in which continuity of action and homogeneity of dramatis personae almost conceal the gaps between its component parts. All might easily have been given without intermission by one set of actors on one stage. The second group extends from the *Barrenness of Anna* (VIII) through the *Visit to Elizabeth* (XIII) ; its integrity as a series is marked by the prologue in the former, in which both audience and players are recommended for divine mercy, and the epilogue in the latter, which thanks the spectators for their patience. The third group should be terminated, I think, with *Christ Disputing in the Temple*, the last of the plays on the boyhood of Christ, because its close,

All that hath herd this consummacion
Of this pagent, your [Christ's] grace them save !

reads like a farewell to the audience. Chambers does not mark this as the close of a group ; but the point of division seems warranted by the context, especially since it thus breaks into halves a group unusually long. The fourth group ends with the *Betraying of Christ*, where the plays were discontinued for the year. Just why the main break should have been made here, with the cycle more than two-thirds completed, and in the midst of a series of plays (XXV-XXXII) related in subject and strikingly similar in manner of presentation, is hard to explain on any other ground than some external necessity like the close of the day. Only fourteen plays, at any rate, were left for the second year, and since they are not easily disunited, we may place them together. The extraordinary length of such a group may be satisfactorily explained. The long play on the Assumption is a late addition to the collection, and it may be that other unnecessary episodes like *King Herod* and the *Descent of the Holy Ghost*

were inserted when it was found that the whole day was open for the performance. This classification of the plays, which is based entirely on textual evidence, may find readier acceptance since it accords closely with a topical division. Group one contains Old Testament themes; group two, the life of Mary previous to the birth of Christ; group three, Christ's birth and boyhood, though an apocryphal story prior to the nativity is prefixed; group four, Christ's manhood; and group five, Christ's trial and subsequent events.

This exposition of the internal composition of the cycle may throw light on certain problems connected with it. It is the commonly accepted opinion that the *Ludus Coventriae* was presented on one fixed stage, not on moveable pageants. But the fair inference seems to be that it was at least derived from a cycle or cycles whose plays, classified topically, were acted in groups by a few companies on their respective vehicles. The first seven plays could easily have been acted as a unit by a few actors on a small stage. More obvious traces of a pageant presentation are found in later portions of the cycle. The prayer in the prologue of the second group invoking divine mercy on "this congregacion" and "the personys here pleand," as well as the call for respectful attention, suggest that a new company of actors had appeared and was seeking to quiet the commotion caused by the shifting of the pageants. For the same reason the first play of the third group is opened noisily by the summoner,

Avoyd, seres, and lete my lorde the buschop come,

as if he was clearing the way for a new pageant, and at the same time lustily shouting rough matter of current interest to regain the audience's distracted attention. This theory is confirmed by the stage direction following the summoner's speech: "Hic intrabit pagentum de purgatione Mariæ et Joseph." Moreover in the succeeding play, the birthplace of Christ is described as,

An hous that is desolat, withowty any walle,

and we know that on pageants, but not on interior stages, the stable was left visible from all four sides (Creizenach, I, 168). Finally, the last of this series ends, as we have seen, with reference to the pageant, which should here be taken literally, although the same word in the *Prologue*—

not an integral part of the cycle—is used with more general application. These points indicate that the *Ludus Coventriae* was a cycle for which moveable pageants, each presenting a group of plays, were provided as stages.

Whether the origin of the *Ludus Coventriae* lay in one cycle or several is perhaps indeterminable at present. Herod dies in the nineteenth play and is taken to hell, but reappears in some of the closing pieces. A considerable portion of the *Adoration* as well as one whole play, is devoted to a rehearsal of the prophecies, as though the two were not originally intended to form parts of the same collection. The plot of the *Visit to Elizabeth* is not consistent with itself. Such evidence implies a borrowing from different sources. Metrical tests, however, aid little in solving the problem. Plays XII–XVIII and XXVI–XXXIX, which in subject are indispensable to the cycle and therefore perhaps the oldest, are metrically the most irregular. But in these plays four of the five groups are represented, showing that the irregularity is not peculiar to one in particular. Nor is any group distinguished by a characteristic meter; it can only be noted that the stanza, *aaabceeb*, does not appear in the second, while in general the interchange of meters was made apparently for the sake of variety. In fact, a conclusion from metrical tests would be similar to that from linguistic investigation—that the present cycle exhibits considerable unity in spite of its structural disjointedness. But at present nothing is known definitely concerning the composite character of the cycle.

But the fact, if it be accepted as such, that the *Ludus Coventriae* was derived from pageant plays, does not force the conclusion that the existing cycle was acted on moveable vehicles. Indeed, reasons to the contrary have been adduced. Creizenach believes the machinery and setting of the plays, as prescribed in the stage directions, to be too elaborate for such presentation. But the records of the Coventry craft plays, as published by Sharp, and also some of the directions of the Chester cycle, presuppose an equally varied and imposing stage display. So also it matters little that the *Prologue* was apparently addressed to a seated audience (p. 1); since the *Prologue* was antedated by the plays, and since even at craft plays the audiences were sometimes seated (Sharp,

p. 20). More to the point is it that the stage directions of plays xxv-xxxii, in groups four and five, imply a large stage on which certain portions—called scaffolds—are reserved for particular persons, and are so arranged that each one separately can be screened from view. A “mid-place,” or general stage, is also mentioned, with a little oratory furnished with stools and cushions. References to constant going and coming on this stage are frequent. One must remember, however, that an elaborately equipped stage is not hinted at in the earlier plays, if we except the one very dubious reference in *Noah's Flood*. And the direction: “What tyme that processyon is enteryd into the place, and the Herowdys takyn his schaffalde, and Pylat and Annas and Cayphas here schaffaldys” is ambiguous. It may denote a permanent stage; but it may just as well signify that the actors rode to the appointed place together and then took their assigned stations. Hence it is safer to believe that in that age of open credulity an unusually large pageant gave room for all the scenic display called for in the actors' instructions. Or several wagons stationed near each other may have been employed for the high priests when not engaged on the “mid-place” or central pageant. It is known that the main pageants sometimes drew subordinate ones—for the accommodation of spectators, Sharp supposes (p. 20)—and for use as stages they could have been placed so near together that armed guards, like the “iiij Jaked men about the pageant” of the Coventry Smiths' Play, could keep the intervening space easily passable, and that a messenger, as in the *Trial*, could address collectively the priests in their respective scaffolds. To assume such a combination of vehicles would be perhaps more radical than the supposition of a fixed stage. Fortunately, the difficult choice of alternatives is not compulsory. For after all, since the stage directions of this and also of the Chester cycle often obviously state what the audience is supposed to see, not what is actually exhibited, too much stress may easily be laid on the indicated arrangement and equipment of the stage. It may be that although in origin these plays (xxv-xxxii) were pageant plays, as they now stand they have been reworked into a cycle for presentation by a company of actors on

a fixed stage. Or it may be that the stage directions give false impressions concerning the mode of acting, and that even these last plays, like those of the earlier groups, were given on a pageant. At any rate, the contrary view, on which rests the burden of proof, has not been established.

If the conclusions here reached have been well-grounded, the manner of presentation of the *Ludus Coventriae* was strikingly similar to that of the Coventry craft plays; for it is known that at Coventry each pageant, in charge of a number of allied crafts, presented a series of plays. This recalls the hypothesis that the *Ludus Coventriae* is the discarded fifteenth century cycle of the Coventry guilds—a theory based on no very tenable arguments. Doubtless the *Ludus Coventriae* had no connection with Coventry. Where and by whom, then, was it acted? Linguistic investigation or some happy historic find must answer the first. As to the second, despite the close of the *Prologue*,

A Sunday next, yf that we may,
At vj. of the belle we gynne oure play,
In N. towne, wherfore we pray,
That God now be 3oure spede. Amen,

we put little trust in the idea that a company of professional actors carried the plays from town to town. Such a company would have given the cycle on two successive days, not in parts in successive years. Only the service of a skilled advance agent and the arrangement of a fixed itinerary—both out of the question in those times—would have made a bi-yearly presentation feasible. So here again there is not sufficient reason for departing from accepted tradition, and our conclusion would read thus: Companies of native actors presenting each a group of plays on its own pageant.

ELBERT N. S. THOMPSON.

Lehigh University.

THE INFLUENCE OF JONSON ON DEKKER.

Both before the Quarrel and after, Dekker, like his fellow ‘poetaster’ Marston, shows traces of the influence of their common antagonist, Jonson. The first and most conspicuous trace, to be found

in the earliest of his extant plays, the *Shoemaker's Holiday*, is the character of Simon Eyre. Eyre is Juniper—of the *Case is Altered*—over again. Both are merry cobblers who suddenly grow rich and then are merrier than ever. But it is not so much in character or deeds that they resemble each other as in utterance. 'Madcaps' both, they exploit a very similar madcap vocabulary and rhetoric. They rattle off questions, imperatives, expletives, and fantastical epithets in breathless succession or alternation. They repeat and reiterate, and accumulate parallelisms and synonyms. They coin words, blunder with words, and ejaculate exuberant nonsense.¹ Nothing could be more unmistakable than the identity of their manner and—what is perhaps more striking—of their whimsical vocabulary.

Presto. Go to, a word to the wise; away, fly, vanish! *C. A.*, I, 1.

Nay, 'slid I am no changeling, I am Juniper still, I keep the pristinate; ha! you mad hieroglyphic, when shall we swagger? *Ib.*

Why, now you come near him, sir; he doth rail, he doth remunerate, he doth chew the cud, in the kindness of an honest imperfection to your worship. *Ib.*, II, 2.

'S blood, why, what! thou art not lunatic, art thou? an thou be'st, avoid, Mephistophilus.² *Ib.*, II, 4.

How, second person! away, away. In thy crotchets already! longitude and latitude! what second, what person, ha?

Tut, no more of this surquedry; I am thine own ad unguem, upsie freeze, pell mell; come, what case, what case?

Not bear what, my mad meridian slave? not bear what? *Ib.*, IV, 3.

What's the old Panurgo gone, departed, cosmographied, ha? *Ib.*, IV, 4.

Away, scoundrel! dost thou fear a little elocution? Shall we be confiscate now? shall we droop now? shall we be now in helogabolus? *Ib.*, V, 4.

Without further citations, the reader of Dekker will recognize the uproarious accents of Simon Eyre; and with further citations he would have run virtually the whole gamut of Eyre's rollicking rhetoric, and would have exhausted his store of

far-fetched appellation³ and phrase.⁴ That the source of much of this is Juniper—the source of Eyre and Juniper both is, in a measure, the hilarious cant of the day—is pretty certain. In the case of Jonson's play, there is evidence of an earlier date,⁵ and of an immediate and striking popularity of the character in question⁶ such as Dekker, sitting in Grubstreet obscurity, would eagerly have availed himself of⁷; and in the case of Dekker's play, there is evidence of his having availed himself of it, for what with Jonson was a minor part is here magnified into a hero who appears on every page, though he has little to do but show off his delectable 'humor.'

It was before the Quarrel,⁸ in 1599, while he was collaborating with Jonson on the *Page of Plymouth*⁹ and *Robert the Second*,⁹ that Dekker imitated the jolly Juniper; it was in the midst of the Quarrel, in 1601, that he had cause to imitate the swaggering Tucca. In *Every Man Out of his Humour*, Jonson had satirized Dekker's friend, Marston, and now, in *Cynthia's Revels*, both him and Dekker; and in his *Satiromastix* Dekker chose to reply—so much at home

³Such as 'mad Greek,' 'mad slave,' 'mad meridian slave,' 'mad Capriccio,' 'ingle,' 'bully,' 'sweet inge' or 'bully,' 'rogue,' 'scoundrel,' etc., in Juniper, and the same in Eyre besides a wealth of others,—especially variations upon 'mad Greek,' as 'True Trojans,' 'mad Cap-padocians,' 'fine, dapper Assyrian lads,' etc. Much of this, of course, is taken from the cant of the day; cf. in Shakspeare 'Trojan,' 'Greek,' 'Cataian.'

⁴Of this there is too much to quote; the more striking are the irrelevant ejaculatory imperatives, 'avaunt,' 'avoid,' 'abscond,' 'vanish,' 'let that pass' (cf. Margery in *Shoemaker*); the interjection 'ha'; and the boisterous adverbs, 'away,' 'pell-mell,' 'helter-skelter.'

⁵Long recognized. Forward limit: 'the merry cobbler's cut in the witty play of the *Case is Altered*,' Nash's *Lenten Stuff*, reg. Jan. 11, 1599. Backward limit: the reference to 'Antonio Balladino,' Anthony Munday, as 'already in print for the best plotter' (*C. A.*, I, 1) which, in turn, echoes Meres' *Wil's Treasury*—'Anthony Mundaye our best plotter'—reg. Sept. 7, 1598. The earliest notice of the *Shoemaker* is in Henslowe, July 15, 1599.

⁶See the allusion in Nash, above, to this very character.

⁷Cf. Dekker's wholesale reproduction of Tucca in *Satiromastix*, probably because his 'humor' had made a palpable hit.

⁸For the best account of the Quarrel see Small, *Stage-Quarrel*, Breslau, 1899.

⁹The *Page of Plymouth*, Aug. 10, 1599; *Robert the Second*, King of Scots, Sept. 3, 1599 (Henslowe).

¹Juniper, indeed, hunts phrases at times somewhat self-consciously—'I have the phrases, man,' II, 4,—a trait which Dekker wisely omits to reproduce.

²*Shoemaker*, v. 4, 'avaunt, avaunt, avoid, Mephistophiles!' An echo of *Faustus*.

was he in the Jonsonian 'style—by appropriating the 'Janus-faced' Captain bodily and turning him even against his creator. In other respects Tucca remains quite the same as in Jonson—only a 'little less gay, less fickle, more revengeful,'¹⁰ and, in addition, a lover. His manner, as in the *Poetaster*, is that of Juniper. It is said to have been taken from one Captain Hannam—that is one of the things reckoned against Ben by the Poetasters for satirical unrighteousness—but, except for a greater extravagance and a swaggering repetition¹¹ of the auxiliaries 'do' and 'shall' and of vocatives after imperatives, it is not new.¹² New or old, it is imitated by Dekker still more faithfully than that of Juniper in Simon Eyre.

Echoes of the style of Juniper and Tucca are by no means limited to Dekker's Eyre and his Tucca or to the plays in which these appear. Snatches of Juniper's vocabulary are to be found on the lips of Babulo and the Beggar in *Patient Grissel*¹³ (1600), and something not only of the vocabulary, but also of the rhetorical tricks of Juniper, Eyre, and Captain Tucca is to be found on the lips of Wyatt and Brett, soldiers as they are, in *Sir Thomas Wyatt*¹⁴ (1602). Tucca's reiteration seems to have spread by infection to other characters in *Satiromastix*, to Sir Quintilian Shorthose,¹⁵ for instance, and it reappears later in some of his citizen comedies—those written in association with Webster and the *Honest Whore*. Mere abrupt reiteration and parallelism, however, are so characteristic of Dekker's dialogue, whether verse or prose, throughout his career, that the presence of those qualities is not enough to prove the influence of Juniper's or Tucca's rhetoric, though it might tend to prove, after a sufficient investigation, the influence of Jonson's earlier rhetoric in general.

¹⁰ Small.

¹¹ 'And thou shall import the wine, old boy, thou shalt do it, little Minos, thou shalt.' 'Punk, kiss me, punk.' Repetition of 'do' is especially common. All of this reappears in the Tucca of Dekker.

¹² The more imposing array of ingenious appellations, too, may be credited to the example of 'honest Capten Hannam.'

¹³ *Patient Grissel*, ed. Hübsch, II. 1923-5, 2288, 'helter skelter,' 'pell-mell,' 'huftie-tuftie,' 'vanish.'

¹⁴ Webster's Works, ed. Hazlitt, vol. 1, pp. 6, 7, 40-41, 45-6. Brett, as a turncoat, is modelled upon Tucca.

¹⁵ Dekker, *Works*, London, 1873, vol. 1, p. 225.

Long after the Quarrel was over, in the *Honest Whore*, of 1604, Dekker, seems in several ways again to be echoing Jonson. The merchant Candido is molested in his own house by gallants, and is supported by his faithful apprentices, by one of them in particular,¹⁶ as is Kitley, the merchant in *Every Man in his Humour*; and though Candido is *par excellence* the patient man, and Kitley on the other hand the jealous man,¹⁷ he has something of Kitley's jerky, nervous manner:

My gown, George, go, my gown.

Come, where's the gown? H. W., III, 1.

O that is well; fetch me my cloak, my cloak!

Stay, let me see, an hour to go and come;

Carry in my cloak again. Yet stay.

E. M. I. H., III, 2.

Unlike any other characters in Dekker, moreover, the patient Candido and his 'longing' and his shrewish wife are done in the spirit of distinctively Jonsonian 'humors.' Their characteristics are read and known of all men, as if written in their foreheads, and are not forgotten even by the characters themselves. And, finally, Matheo, the 'high-flying' gallant, displays, in the Second Part of this play, a mannerism of omitting the pronoun in the first person, which—though possibly too common an affectation for that—may have been imitated from Hermogenes in the *Poetaster*.¹⁸

In *Westward Ho*, a play written in the same year in conjunction with Webster, there is unmistakable borrowing from the plot of *Every Man out of his Humour*.¹⁹ The wife of the citizen Tenterhook is in love with the gallant Monopoly as the wife of the citizen Deliro, Fallace, is with the courtier Fastidious Brisk, and either one, when at her husband's suit her lover is lodged in jail for debt, endeavors to bail or buy him out. Master Parenthesis, moreover, as the envious mischief-maker running with tales from husband to wife and from wife to husband, is a replica—vaguer in contour and duller in hue—of the Macilente of the same play.

¹⁶ George in H. W. and Thomas in E. M. I. H. H.

¹⁷ The jealous citizen is not left unrepresented in Dekker—in *Westward Ho* and *Northward Ho*,—but he is only sketched.

¹⁸ II, 1; 2 H. W., III, 2.

¹⁹ Registered April 8, 1600, printed the same year. W. H. was registered March 2, 1605.

In much indeed that cannot now be definitely ascribed to influence, Dekker is at one with Jonson—in interests, in methods, in tone, and even in vocabulary. After Jonson he is the poet of London life, of ‘merchants and apprentices, gulls and gallants,’ and—beyond Jonson—the partisan of the citizens and their wives against the courtiers;²⁰ after him he paints this life in lively and veracious colors, and his sympathies and judgments, his humor and morality, are of the same coarse-grained but manly cast; after him, once more, he uses a language rich in racy Saxon, in cant, slang, and dialect. The friend of Marston, Dekker has little in common with him, as he has little in common with a better friend and a collaborator, Webster; he has not their burrowing, dissolving turn of mind,—neither the obscene ghastliness of Marston nor the ghastliness of Webster, which is sublime;—but he has the simplicity and soundness of vision and the bourgeois interests of Jonson. The rise—or the development—of this oneness of temper and interests is no doubt to be assigned to the period of our poets’ collaboration for Henslowe, before Jonson had struck off into his thorny path of satire and humors; and the persistence of it, on either side, is attested, if by nothing else, by the instances already adduced of Dekker’s unmistakable imitation of Jonson in the five or six years which follow, and by Jonson’s less extensive, but still more unmistakable, imitation of Dekker so early as in *Eastward Ho* and so late as in the *Devil is an Ass*.²¹

ELMER EDGAR STOLL.

Harvard University.

²⁰ Not after Jonson only, but also after Shakspeare. The latter, as I have shown in *John Webster* (Cambridge, Mass., 1905), pp. 74-79, Dekker, from *Satiromastix* through the *Honest Whore*, imitated in the portrayal of citizenesses, both of fair name and of foul name, and in the matter of partisanship.

²¹ See the explicit allusions in the prologues of both plays.—*E. H.*, as the authors avow, is written in imitation and rivalry of Dekker and Webster’s partisan citizen-play, *Westward Ho*. (Whether Jonson had actually a hand in *E. H.* we cannot here inquire.) In a like general way the *D. I. A. A.* is indebted to Dekker’s *If this be not a Good Play*. The motives are the same—men baffling and outdeviling the devils themselves,—and in both plays devils take service with men. See Herford, *Literary Relations of England and Germany*.

“PAW.”

In Congreve’s *Love for Love* (v, iv), Tattle says to Miss Prue, “O fy! marrying is a paw thing.” This word was always a mystery to me. The *Oxford Dictionary* cites this and several other instances of its use, and defines it, “Improper, naughty, obscene,” which is clearly not the meaning here. As to the etymology, it says, “apparently a variant of *pah*.”

In the (ms.) *History of the Tuesday Club*¹ (circ. 1750), I find what I have no doubt is the true etymology. The writer says: “Our politest people, and persons of the first fashion and quality, use . . . for ‘positive,’ ‘pos,’ for ‘paltry,’ ‘paw,’ for ‘reputation,’ ‘rep,’ for ‘incognito,’ ‘incog.’”

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

HAVELOK’S LAMENT.

In the romance of *Havelok*, the young prince, being cruelly treated by the churl Grim and his wife, exclaims,

Weilawei!

That euere was I kinges bern!
That him ne hauede grip or ern,
Leoun or wlf, wluine or bere,
Or other best that wolde him dere.”

(ll. 570-4.)

In *Mod. Lang. Notes* (vii, 134), I suggested the change of *dere*, ‘injure,’ to *nere*, ‘save, deliver.’ Dr. O. F. Emerson, in a note in his *Middle English Reader*, cites my suggestion, but does not approve it. His explanation is, “Havelok laments not only that he is a king’s son, but that wild beasts do not have him rather than such inhuman people.” “Have,” however, is hardly an equivalent for *dere*.

I incline, myself, to abandon my suggestion, chiefly on the ground that I can recall no such late use of *nere*. But it does not seem reasonable

¹ The Tuesday Club was the leading club of Annapolis in the middle of the 18th century. The so-called “History,” however, is not a veracious chronicle, but a witty burlesque in the style of Swift, written by Dr. Alexander Hamilton. It is in the library of the Johns Hopkins University.

to me that Havelok, though he had been gagged by Grim, and buffeted by his wife, with a prospect of being drowned, should sigh to be torn to pieces by wild beasts. It looks like what a Scotchman would call "prayin' for sma' mercies."

At present, I am disposed to look upon the three lines as a compassionate exclamation of the poet, who, remembering the old superstition that "the lion will not touch the true prince," cries "(A King's son) whom not even wild beasts would harm (was thus cruelly treated by Christians!)" This preserves the text, is reasonable, and accounts for the change of person in the pronoun.

WM. HAND BROWNE.

Johns Hopkins University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Aprilwetter von HANS ARNOLD. Edited, with Notes and Vocabulary, by LAWRENCE FOSSLER, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures, University of Nebraska. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1905. 12mo., vi and 144 pp.

Professor Fossler's school and college edition of Hans Arnold's *Aprilwetter* is quite an object lesson in itself—especially for the teacher of modern languages who uses the text and for the editor who chooses the text.

With the many stories at his command, which it is gratifying to find Professor Fossler obtained the author's consent to use—a mere, small matter of etiquette which editors through too great zeal overlook or deliberately ignore—a better selection might possibly have been made. Yet the stories are amusing, and personal preferences on the part of the reviewer can in no sense detract from the value of these three as educational material.

Professor Fossler's introduction is interesting—extremely so for the educator to whom the reason for the choice of a certain text must be of moment, but it can hardly be so to the student, who looks to the introduction for an account of his author and for specific information as to the text he is about to study which cannot readily be put into the notes and vocabulary. Such a one as that which Professor Fossler gives, properly be-

longs in the announcement of his text to the profession, or in a short paper or note on Frau von Bülow as a source for texts for the use of the English and American student of German.

The edition fails in accomplishing the purpose for which it was gotten up, because of the many evidences of carelessness. Chief amongst which are misprints, imperfect impressions due to the use of old type, and here and there misinterpretations of the German.

An incomplete list of these is appended:

p. 1, line 6. *Szepter* instead of *Scepter* or *Zepter*.

p. 54, line 7. *Gastav* instead of *Gustav*.

p. 62, line 21. *blinde Mut* instead of *blinde Wut*.

p. 73, line 2. *affort* instead of *effort*.

p. 73, note to p. 2.—1. *Tee und Abendbrot-Fest*, the first *b* in *Abendbrot*, needs new type.

p. 79, note 6. *für Professors* refers back to *Exzellenzens* p. 17, line 22, while the words "für Professors," p. 17, line 26, have no note indicated for them.

Above all things, a textbook of this sort should have uniformity in spelling. Throughout the text and in the note at the top of this page we find *Exzellenz* but on the last line in the note *Exzellenzens*—a bit of carelessness which reflects on editor and professional proofreader alike.

p. 82. *Borsdorfer* needs a new type for *B*.

p. 93. Note 3 to p. 63 is rather unfortunate in rendering *auf ihr ehrlich Gesicht hin*, by "on her face," as in some parts of our country this expression is the equivalent of "cheek" (audacity, boldness). "The face of the fellow" in slang means the "effrontery of the man." However, much "face" the old lady may have had, and she was blessed with a good deal of that article, in this instance she was merely forgetful, not "fresh." By the retention of the single word *ehrlich* in translation, the note will be deprived of its slangy character and the point of the German *ehrlich Gesicht* will be brought out clearly. A note on why it is *ihr ehrlich Gesicht* instead of *ihr ehrliches Gesicht* would seem to meet all the student's needs at this point.

In the grammatical notes Professor Fossler has been more fortunate; they are often, indeed, most excellent.

EMIL A. C. KEPPLER.

College of the City of New York.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

The Principles and Progress of English Poetry, with representative masterpieces and notes, by CHARLES MILLS GAYLEY and CLEMENT C. YOUNG. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1905.

Since the uniform requirements for admission to our colleges north and south have become each year more and more widely adopted, publishers have sought in every possible way to supply the growing demand for well-edited, moderate-priced texts of the poems and prose pieces required. Thus there are the excellent paper editions of the Riverside Literature Series, the Cambridge Literature Series, the Silver Series of English Classics, Maynard's English Classic Series, and many others, which have proved almost indispensable to a modern college course. Besides these, publishers have put forth in one volume carefully annotated selections of masterpieces of prose and poetry, such as Pancoast's *Standard English Poems* and *Standard English Prose*, Syle's *From Milton to Tennyson*, George's *From Chaucer to Arnold*, and Parrott and Long's *English Poems from Chaucer to Kipling*, all arranged with biographical and bibliographical data, either in the notes or as connecting links between the texts. The present book, however, differs from all the others of its kind in that it attempts to combine into one volume a digest of literary criticism, a connected history of English literature, biographical sketches, complete texts of the poems required for entrance to most American colleges, and full critical notes, so that it may serve as a *vade mecum* during the four years of a High School course. Professor Gayley in his preface thus sets forth the purpose and method of the volume:

"This book is designed to serve as a kind of compendium or manual, not only for students and teachers, but for the general reader who takes interest in the materials and history of the higher English poetry, and seeks a simple statement of its principles in relation to life, conduct, and art. . . . The introduction on the Principles of Poetry aims to answer the questions that inevitably arise when poetry is the subject of discussion, and to give the questioner a grasp upon the essentials necessary to appreciation and to the formation of

an independent judgment. Hence the discussion of the relation of art to nature, and of literature to art; of poetry to literature, and of verse and prose to poetry; of the creative or imaginative expression in poetry proper, and of its association with rhetoric and logic; of rhythm and metre, melody, harmony, and structural form in verse, and the relation of all these to the organic principles of speech; of the kinds of poetry, ballad and epic, reflective and descriptive recital, lyric, elegy, and ode, drama, pastoral and idyl, satire and philosophical poem, and the æsthetic conditions precedent to and attendant upon each in turn; finally, of poetic tests and of the terminology of such criticism as the general reader is likely to consider or apply. This portion of the book should be mastered by the teacher, and re-tailed to younger pupils as occasion offers and discretion dictates. By the more advanced student it should be read, as a whole, some time during the course, for it presents a system; and it should be applied continually in the appraisement of poems as they are studied" (pp. vi and ix).

Professor Gayley has succeeded in compressing within the narrow limits of less than a hundred pages a complete system of poetics and of criticism, and furnishes the student with the necessary critical apparatus for the study of the masterpieces of poetry. But much as we may admire the studied compression and repression of this Introduction, we cannot help feeling that the style is ill adapted to the development and training of the class of students for whom it is intended. It might seem to be a carefully prepared digest of lectures delivered to college seniors, rather than a course of study for high school students. At times the language is needlessly stilted and pedantic, and would serve utterly to bewilder even the most conscientious advanced pupil of the high school. Imagine the student, for example, struggling with the following definition of poetry: "From the point of view of the *subject and the form*, poetry may be defined as the imaginative and emotive expression or suggestion of that which has significance, in the rhythmical and preferably metrical medium of language appropriate to the subject. From the point of view of the *purpose*, it is an imaginative attempt, by means of rhythmical, and preferably metrical language, to awaken

emotions in the reader or hearer that correspond to the mood of the poet himself" (p. xxxix).

Or picture his efforts to unravel the meaning in the following explanation of how metres are varied: "The aim of artistic technique is not to reproduce the unyielding sameness of natural law alone, but also to display the manifold details and differences of garb, through which Nature may reveal herself, by emphasizing the variety of her manifestations to certify their common spirit and significance" (p. lviii).

Clearly anticipating the difficulty the pupil will have in comprehending this Introduction, Professor Gayley recommends that "This portion of the book should be mastered by the teacher, and retailed to younger pupils as occasion offers and discretion dictates" (p. ix). But, as this is intended to be a useful and practical text-book, why not, one might ask, write an introduction that the student can read, understand, and enjoy for himself, without any retailing process on the part of the teacher?

There is, moreover, a lavish and useless display of figurative language, where the figures, far from helping to convey the thought, serve only to confuse it and to lead the student away from the main idea. The following are typical examples of such tawdry adornment: "Of course all these accentuations of the usual method of excited utterance, and these departures from the careless order of conversational speech [antithesis, balance, parallelisms, climax, etc.] are common to the prose of practical literature. But the devices of the former or *emotional* kind [simile, metaphor, etc.] appear frequently in poetry, as if playing the part of waves on which the fleet of imagery—really poetic—may fare afloat. Devices of the latter or *ordering* kind serve as winds to marshal battle-ship and cockle-shell to the haven that is the heart" (p. xlix).

The charm of blank verse is thus pictured: "Upon the cadence of prose diction—broad of sweep and free from restrictions of stress and quantity—the iambic convention is imposed; not, however, as a die pressed upon molten gold, but rather as a vestment of Coan simplicity thrown about an Aphrodite,—heightening the natural grace that it half conceals" (p. lx).

And, finally, the sestet in the sonnet is said to have the following effect: "It gilds thought with

the tracery of instance, crowns it with the sufficient and inevitable actuality that lies within the wisdom of art" (p. lxxxvi).

Worse, however, than pedantry and useless ornamentation, there is an occasional tendency to looseness and obscurity of style, as in the following sentences:

"Paraphrasing, therefore, should be employed, if at all, in the schools, not as an insult to the poet's intelligence, formative skill, and inspiration, but as a necessary, though unfortunate, concession to the inexperience of the pupil, as a means to the removal of that necessity, and as an exercise in translation, which, when pupils study Greek and Latin, has little reason for existence" (p. xvii).

"Those who enjoy, enjoy the accepted rhythm; those who do not, are not in the artistic or poetic mood. Consequently, mankind has from the beginning acknowledged that taste or feeling; that is to say, the *general* taste or feeling, and not judgment, that is to say, the individual judgment, is the arbiter in art" (p. xxx).

"Similarly the innuendo insinuated by the statement that a monk is not pale as a forpined ghost [*sic*] depends for its success upon the probability that the reader will jocosely leap to the conclusion that the monk is the exact opposite, all that he was not said to be, a wine-bibber and purple-nosed" (p. xlix).

"So far as imagination goes, *Horatius* is principally a vivid representation of images that, if experienced in real life, would move our feelings by their simplicity and fervor, and that still more move when apparently remembered by the minstrel, and recited in a season of tranquillity with all the focussing of emotional effect and dramatic coloring that manner and order can contribute" (p. xliii).

Such sentences are enough to call forth the shade of Dick Steele with another "Humble Petition of WHO and WHICH."

Occasionally one is inclined to take issue with Professor Gayley on a question of fact, as, for example, when he tells us that "poetry frequently indulges in archaic or obsolescent forms of speech, for these recall the simpler days when words had more direct and explicit meaning than now" (p. xl). To what golden past in the history of our language do these "simpler days" belong?

Though most rhetorics agree in considering

personification, apostrophe, and vision as species of metaphor,¹—*idealized metaphors*, Professor Gayley calls them,—not all would agree with him in identifying vision and simile, as he does in the following examples: “And close akin to this trope [apostrophe] ’s Vision, by which the distant, or past or future, is regarded, and spoken of as present. ‘I see before me the Gladiator lie,’ says Byron; and the image is merely a *simile idealized*: ‘I hold in mind the image of the Gladiator as if I saw him.’” And in the oft-cited passage from Keats,

“So these two brothers with their murdered man
Rode past fair Florence”

we are told that the figure is “nothing but a metaphor or simile in which time has been swallowed.” “The brothers have not yet murdered their companion, but he is as good as murdered” (pp. xlv–xlvi). It is difficult to see how in either case the figure could possibly be classed as a simile, for we have to do, not with a comparison of unlike objects, but with identity between mental and physical processes applied to the same object.

It seems strange that both in the introduction and in the text and notes, the editors should cling to the traditional and mistaken punctuation and interpretation of *Lyceidas*, ll. 56–57,

“Ay me! I fondly dream
‘Had ye been there,’—for what could that have done?”

I give Professor Gayley’s spelling and punctuation (p. xlix). This passage is here interpreted, and is generally understood, to be an example of broken utterance or aposiopesis. But Professor C. A. Smith, *Modern Language Notes*, xi (1896), p. 28, corrects this long-continued misinterpretation and gives the proper punctuation and true meaning:

“Ay me! I fondly dream
‘Had ye been there,’ for what could that have done?”

“If there had been a sudden and violent turn to the poet’s thought, the construction would have required the conjunction ‘but’ instead of ‘for,’ the former being the almost preëmpted word in such construction. The true meaning would seem to be, ‘It is foolish [fond] in me to keep imag-

ining Had ye been there, for what could your presence have done?’”

In his treatment of accents, hovering and wrenched, Professor Gayley cites *Comus*, l. 421,

“She that hath that is clad in complete steel,”

and says it is to be scanned “with a suspended or deferred stress over ‘in com.’ Both syllables of the succeeding foot are heavily accented” (p. lxvi). It seems more natural, however, to read *cóplete*, with the stress on the first syllable. In certain disyllables,—*complete*, *adverse*, *extreme*, *secure*, *sincere*, etc.,—the accent in Shakespeare’s time was unsettled,² just as it is to-day in such words as *access*, *contents*, *expert*, *annex*, *adult*, etc.

Though in the preface Professor Gayley emphasizes the importance of reproducing the exact orthography of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and other early poets, and though Mr. Young has been exceedingly careful and accurate with his texts (if Mr. Young is to be given all the credit for that part of the volume), the following quotations in the Introduction show a strange disregard for the proper spelling:

“Smale fowles maken melodye
That slepen al the night with open eye.”
Prol., 9–10 (p. xlix).

On p. 8 appears the proper reading:

“And smale fowles maken melodye
That slepen all the night with open ye.”

The spelling *eye* is found in only one MS.

“let olde thinges pase.” *Prol.*, l. 175 (p. civ),

should read,

“leet olde thinges pace.” See p. 13.

“She that hath that is clad in complete steel.”
Comus, l. 421 (p. lxvi).

See p. 81, where the spelling is *compleat*.

Brief as are the limits of Professor Gayley’s Introduction, he is not content with a simple, clear exposition of principles, he seeks to make a psychological analysis of the processes by which certain effects are obtained. The average school boy, however, does not care to analyze the logical effect of an hyperbole, but he does need to know

¹See Gummere, *Handbook of Poetics*, p. 93; Newcomer, *Elements of Rhetoric*, p. 249.

²See Schmidt’s *Shakespeare Lexicon*, 2, Appendix 1; Schipper, *Grundriss der eng. Metrik*, p. 174.

the figure when he sees it. Hyperbole, Professor Gayley tells us, is a figure of logical artifice, based upon logical fallacy or mock logic. "Now, it is an interesting fact," he continues, "not hitherto noticed, so far as I know, that most, if not all, of these figures depend for their characteristic, not upon the use of poetic images, but upon their appeal to the reasoning faculty of the hearer. The reader, by an instinctive logic, knows that the hyperbole does not reason fairly, but he knows also that the author credits him with too much common sense to be deceived. The reader is consequently flattered by the appeal to his intelligence, and the author gains his point, which was not to maintain all that the hyperbole affirmed, but to carry the reader *part way* toward the violent and impossible conclusion. In the lines,

'Will all great Neptune's ocean wash this blood
Clean from my hand? No; this my hand will rather
The multitudinous sea incarnadine,
Making the green one red.'

Macbeth argues from the fact that a certain amount of water used in washing a bloody hand will itself turn red to the conclusion that his hand would turn any amount of water, even the ocean itself, 'one red.' The reader, instinctively detecting the strained logic, accepts, however, the implication that the hand is steeped in blood beyond the common" (p. xlvi).

Is the student to be taught the beauty of one of the most imaginative passages in Shakespeare by any such painful process of logic as this?

Chaucer, too, Professor Gayley would have us believe, was given to this same mock logic, and made the same "flattering appeal to our intelligence" in his inimitable line on the monk,

"He was not pale as a forpynd goost"

"Similarly the innuendo insinuated by the statement that a monk is not pale as a forpynd goost depends for its success upon the probability that the reader will jocosely leap to the conclusion that the monk is the exact opposite, all that he was not said to be, a wine-bibber and purple-nosed. But both Chaucer and the reader are aware of many alternatives of complexion for jovial men, between the pallid and the purple" (p. xlix). If the successful appreciation of Chaucer's ro-

guish humor is dependent only upon such a "jocose leap," many a reader will doubtless find Chaucer dull and uninteresting.

This same fondness for over-minute analysis is apparent in the treatment of vowel sequence in poetry: "The third [kind of vowel sequence], depending upon a *pivotal vowel*, is much affected by Milton. Sometimes for five or ten lines together the ascent to, and descent from, a central vowel sound, seems to be the guiding principle of quality or tone. In the following from *Il Penseroso*, such a vowel obtains about the middle of each verse; it stands forth unique in sound and importance:

And let some strange mysterious dream,
Wave at his wings in airy stream
Of lively portraiture displayed.

I should call this the *jewelled* line. The note struck by the central vowel is not repeated on either side. The next line of the passage, however, reverts to the sequence of alternation; one sequence overdone would lose its savor" (p. lxxiv). And even the simple, unadorned poetry of Wordsworth is said to "gleam with lines *jewelled* in sound and sense." It is unfortunate that the tone of the Introduction should be weakened by any such sentimental preciosity. In many ways this Introduction fails of the purpose for which it was intended, namely, to serve as a simple, useful guide for high school students preparing for college.

The main body of the volume,—the texts, historical and biographical sketches, and the notes,—has been done with better success, and with a clearer sense of the demands both of the subject and of the reader. The style is simple, clear, and natural, free from idle adornment, and well adapted to the student. The texts are well edited, and the notes numerous, helpful, and suggestive. The characteristics of each period of literature are clearly summed up in a brief introductory chapter, and to the selections from each author are prefixed an excellent biographical sketch of the man, and an estimate of his work and character.

In the texts, attention might be called to the following points:

p. 9, l. 49.

"As wel in Cristendom as in hethenesse."

The editors read this line with slurring of the *-en* in *Cristendom*, reducing it to a disyllable. But such an accentuation of *Cristendom* would be metrically impossible in Middle English. The syllable *-dom* would require at least a secondary accent.³ Hence we should read

As wél in Crístendóm as in héthenesse,

reducing to one metrical syllable the two words as in [as'n].⁴ Or read with Skeat as *hethenesse*, on the authority of the Hn. and Hl. MSS.

p. 10, l. 73,

"His hors were gode, but he ne was not gay."

Here the editors mark the *e* in *gode* as silent. But since in the strong form of the predicate adjective, the *e* is usually sounded,⁵ it would seem better to consider this as an epic cæsure, and read *góde* / but *hé*, giving full syllabic value to the *e*.

p. 10, l. 76,

"Al bismotered with his habergeoun."

p. 12, l. 131,

"That no drope ne fille upon her brest."

It is difficult to see how the editors mean these lines to be read, without any indication of the so-called trochaic beginning, *Al bismótered*, *Thát no drópe*. The accent has been properly marked in ll. 170, 294, *Gínglen*, *Twénty bókes*.

There is no note on the metrically difficult line, *ProL.*, l. 320 (p. 17),

"His purchasing || mǐghte not been inféct."

Skeat says "the word *might-e* occupies the fourth [third?] foot in the line." The only possible reading then would be *mighté*, an altogether impossible accentuation. Mather makes no suggestion as to how it should be read. The only solution seems to be that there is a medial pause at the cæsure, so that we read,

His púrchasíng || mǐghte not beén inféct.⁶

Skeat's example has been followed in altering certain passages and lines in Chaucer that might

offend modern taste, and in indicating the substituted words by inclosing them in brackets.

l. 504,

"A [dirty] shepherde and a clene shepe."

l. 625,

"[And quyk] he was and [chirped] as a sparwe."

ll. 649-50,

"He wolde suffre for a quart of wyn,
A good felawe to [have his wikked syn]."

l. 689,

"No berd hadde he, ne never sholde have,
As smothe it was as it were late y-shave;
I trowe [his cheke and eek his chin were bare]."

In such cases it would seem better to omit the lines altogether, rather than to substitute such weak dilutions of the original.

There is little criticism to make of the notes, except that for greater convenience reference might have been made to the pages as well as to the lines of the text, and that occasionally the editors, in their laudable desire to make the student work out questions for himself, have left unsettled problems too difficult for him to solve. As, for example, the following: *Comus*, l. 380 (p. 484), "*all to ruffl'd*, one of the most difficult expressions of the poem. Though Milton uses no hyphen, editors have explained that one may have been intended, thus fixing the meaning as either *all-to* (altogether, or exceedingly) *ruffled*, or *all to-ruffled* ('to' being an intensive prefix common in Old and Middle English). Still another interpretation is made by regarding 'to' as the adverb 'too.' Which seems the most probable interpretation?" (p. 484).

Again, *Comus*, l. 553 (p. 487), "*drowsie frighted*, these epithets are curiously used. 'Drowsy' is the normal characteristic of the steeds, since they draw the litter of sleep; while 'frighted' is their temporary condition from hearing the noise of *Comus's* rout. Some of the editions have *drowsy-flighted* (flying drowsily), and still others *drowsy-freighted* (weighed down with sleep). The student should decide among these three possible readings." Upon what is he to base his decision? Is he prepared to make such judgments? See also p. 551, ll. 161-164.

P. 516, note to l. 185 of *Tam O'Shanter*,

³ See Morsbach, *Mittelenglische Grammatik*, § 46, 1.

⁴ See Mather's edition of the *Prologue*, Riv. Lit. Series, p. 139.

⁵ ten Brink, *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, § 234; Schipper, *Englische Metrik*, I, 476.

⁶ See Alden's *English Verse*, p. 20 f.; Schipper, *Eng. Metrik*, I, 460-461, II, 36 f.

"Even Satan glowered and fidgeted fu' fain."
 "Fu' fain" is explained as "very moist"!

With the exception of these few minor details, the work of editing and annotating has been admirably done, and, in spite of the weak points in the Introduction, the volume should prove a useful and excellent text-book for high schools and for the lower classes in college.

J. M. MCBRYDE, JR.

Sweet Briar Institute, Va.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

RAFAEL SALILLAS: *Un Gran Inspirador de Cervantes: El Doctor Juan Huarte y su Examen de Ingenios*. Madrid: 1905.

This little book, by a distinguished member of the Madrid medical fraternity, ranks high among the publications incident to the tri-centennial of *Don Quixote*. It deserves to be called to the attention of *cervantistas* the world over. As a medical man, Don Rafael Salillas seeks to explain the evolution of Cervantes' literary genius from the time of the *Galatea* to the *Persiles y Segismunda*. The graft of the critical and picaresque upon the romantic, chivalric and metrical character of Cervantes strikes every reader of *Don Quixote*. It is this blending of two spirits in *Don Quixote*, this dual point of view in Cervantes, that Dr. Salillas has penetrated with all the scientific skill which he brings to the problem from his profession. More important, he claims to have found in the *Examen de Ingenios* of Dr. Juan Huarte a hitherto neglected source of definite inspiration utilized by Cervantes.

The mature philosophy of Cervantes in his masterpiece was gained by experience, by an unequalled faculty of observation, and by insatiable thirst for information through reading. His critical faculties once developed through experience and study, we may suppose Cervantes to have renounced those forms of fiction and the drama which he once admired and zealously cultivated, — albeit with relatively little success. But, as Dr. Salillas remarks, "the primitive literary person-

ality of Cervantes is not lost; if it had been lost, he would not have written his immortal work" (p. 148). The mature fruit of his spirit is explained by the *ingerto picaresco* upon an imperishable trunk of extravagant and seductive romanticism. As Valera has said, "Cervantes se muestra siempre enamorado de lo novelesco y lo trágico" (*Disertaciones y juicios literarios*, Madrid, 1890, p. 68). The mature fruit of this graft has become the highest expression of the Spanish national character. But Dr. Salillas supposes that, had Cervantes simply brought the critical, practical spirit of the contemporary *pícaro* to bear upon the wild imaginings of the *caballero andante*, he would have produced either an *Hidalgo apicarado* or a *Pícaro caballero* (p. 154). But, as we know, the fusion is not casual or superficial; it is deep and intimate. Now, our critic is a man of science, and he uses throughout forcible scientific terms: the *elemento fusionador*, required in this chemical process, must be found. "This fusion could not take place without the powerful intervention of the *Examen de Ingenios* (published in 1575) with a psychological formula which limits the jurisdiction of the understanding and of the imagination, together with the disturbances which each may feel, thus giving not only the definition of a type of madman and of a form of madness, but also the primordial pattern of an entire work with its two constituent elements" (p. 154).

That Cervantes makes no mention of his debt to Huarte is not held by Dr. Salillas to disprove his theory. We know the book to have attracted widespread attention both in and out of Spain. Indeed, Cervantes deliberately states in his *Prólogo* that his work is to have none of the accompaniments of a scholarly document, — no references, no quotations, no footnotes. His whole literary career, however, we know to have been occupied with the gathering of facts and the digesting of important ideas. Our critic, then, seriously contemplates "la reconstitución de las lecturas de Cervantes," in so far as the celebrated *Examen de Ingenios* of Dr. Juan Huarte is concerned. He hopes that other investigations will throw more light upon the subject.

As will be seen in the following *résumé* of his conclusions, Dr. Salillas finds unmistakable traces

of the definite influence of Huarte's treatise, not only in *Don Quixote*, but also in the minor works, early as well as late:

1. The epithet *Ingenioso Hidalgo* is adopted from the *Examen de Ingenios*.

2. The fashion of Don Quixote's mental disturbance is derived from certain passages in this same work.

3. The same is true of *El Licenciado Vidriera*, one of the *Novelas Ejemplares*.

4. Cervantes himself is the author of an actual *Examen de Ingenios* in *Galatea*.

5. Cervantes changes a psycho-physiological doctrine of Huarte into a dramatic symbolism in *Persiles y Sigismunda*.

We have space only to briefly summarize the arguments under these five headings.

1 and 2. Dr. Salillas draws attention to the prominence of the adjective *ingenioso* applied to the *Hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha* in the title of the work, and in chapters 2, 6 and 16 of Part 1. Don Quixote's mental disturbance is a constant trait, with limitations set at the outset. Save along one line, he is perfectly sane. The reading of books of chivalry alone distinguished him from any other worthy *hidalgo*. "La locura de Don Quixote, la transformación del hidalgo, es cosa de ingenio, es reflejo de determinadas manifestaciones del ingenio, es debida á la ingeniosa literatura de los libros de caballería que se la ingiere en el cerebro, lo destemplan y le hace proceder con arreglo á las determinantes de la imaginativa" (p. 56). With more reason than had Ariosto in his *Orlando Furioso*, Cervantes had to include the madness of his hero in his very expressive title. Yet to call Don Quixote *loco* or *furioso* would have been highly inappropriate. He hit upon the remarkable adjective *ingenioso* in the work of Huarte, used in precisely the dignified significance which he wished to convey regarding the warped *ingenio* of his hero. In the psycho-physiological doctrine of Huarte, "las artes y ciencias que aprenden los hombres son unas imágenes y figuras que los ingenios engendraron dentro de la memoria," because the word *ingenio* "desciende del verbo *ingeniero*, que quiere decir engendrar dentro de sí una figura entera y verdadera que representa al vivo la naturaleza del sujeto

cuya es la ciencia que se aprende" (p. 62). Huarte further compares the extravagant products of the mind of an *ingenioso* to the birth of abortions in the physical world.

But where Cervantes is found most strikingly in accord with the sixteenth century Doctor is in the pathological explanation of Don Quixote's madness. In Huarte's eyes, we are all mad, in varying degrees and along different lines. From circumstances of environment, from intemperance in our practices,—we all suffer from divers distempers, some of them physical, some mental. Each has his particular form of distemper. "Si el hombre cae en alguna enfermedad, por la cual el cerebro de repente muda su temperatura (como es la manía, melancolía y frenesía), en un momento acontece perder (si es prudente) cuanto sabe, y dice mil disparates; y si es necio, adquiere más ingenio y habilidad que antes tenía." Note, further, that in Huarte's doctrine "la locura es siempre un modo de ingenio," and that "manía es una destemplanza caliente y seca del cerebro." When we remember that Cervantes says of his hero: "del poco dormir y del mucho leer, se le secó el cerebro, de manera que vino á perder el juicio," we see the interest of Dr. Salillas' pathological explanation of Don Quixote's madness. "La definición de las causas de la locura de Don Quixote está hecha con arreglo á la doctrina de las destemplanzas, y que con arreglo á la misma doctrina aparece la forma de locura del *Ingenioso Hidalgo*, que lo que tiene es particular lesión en una de las potencias racionales, en la imaginativa, no en el entendimiento" (p. 77).

Not only did Cervantes find in the *Examen de Ingenios* a scientific study of just that mania of the imagination from which his hero was suffering, but he even found a parallel case quoted "in little" in Huarte's treatise, which Salillas cites entire (pp. 78, 79). Finally, then, Cervantes gets from Huarte his use of *ingenioso* in the sense of a man whose imagination has warped his judgment.

3. Just as in Cervantes' masterpiece his imagination leads Don Quixote to believe he is a *caballero andante*, so in *El Licenciado Vidriera* Tomás Rodaja is persuaded that he is made of glass. The cases are exactly parallel. By a con-

vincing juxtaposition of texts from Huarte's story of a certain precocious page and from Cervantes' parallel account of the *ingenio sutil* of Tomás, Dr. Salillas claims that the former inspired not only the story of *El Licenciado Vidriera*, but also its symbolism. "En el caso que nos ocupa, Cervantes convierte en representación plástica una teoría científica" (p. 92).

4. In the *Galatea*, Cervantes' early pastoral in which the romantic and tragic notes predominate, Dr. Salillas draws attention to two notable *variaciones de estilo*. The former is found in the sensible discussion of the shepherds Lenio and Tirsi relative to the amount of knowledge our souls bring with them into the world at birth, and the subsequent additions to this knowledge. The two theories herein expounded are found in the seventh chapter of Huarte's treatise. The second *variación* is in the fourth book of the *Galatea*, where Caliope in verse passes in review the *diferencia de ingenio* exhibited by the great men of Spain. This whole idea, together with the technical phraseology employed, seems undoubtedly to have been suggested by the process only casually employed by Huarte in his investigation of certain *ingenios* in his twelfth chapter.

5. Finally, in *Persiles y Segismunda*, Dr. Salillas again finds put into dramatic symbolism a theory of Huarte: that of the sudden passion of wrath being due to the effect upon the heart produced by the sight of some object. The parallel here is established between the sixth chapter of the *Examen de Ingenios* and the tragic episode introduced in the narrative of the journey of Periandro and Auristela to Rome. The details of the explanation of the phenomenon of wrath are here almost exactly identical in the two authors.

This mere outline of the scientific conclusions of Dr. Salillas' critical method can give no idea of the accumulative proof he advances in their support. As he says himself of the path of investigation which he has opened: "Esto no es más que el comienzo." One cannot but feel in laying down this work that a flood of light has been let in upon the deeper and hidden workings of Cervantes' mind, and that Dr. Juan Huarte de San Juan, the medical philosopher of the six-

teenth century, was "el gran inspirador de Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra."

WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT.

Haverford College.

BRIEF MENTION.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Die Briefe Der Frau Rath Goethe, gesammelt und herausgegeben von ALBERT KÖSTER. Leipzig, Carl Ernst Poeschel, 1904.

These letters of Goethe's mother, covering the period from 1774 to 1808, are both valuable to the student of Goethe and interesting to the casual reader. Her circle of correspondents was a wide one and included some of the people who played very important parts in the life of her son. With Lavater, the Duchess Anna Amalia of Weimar, Wieland and Christiane Vulpius, for example, she carried on a spirited correspondence extending over a considerable period of time. By far the greater part of the letters, however, are those written to her distinguished son himself. And these contain not only a wealth of interesting biographical allusion, but also the fullest testimony of her comprehension of him, his aims and desires, at the times when he was generally misunderstood by his associates.

Aside from their purely biographical import the letters are well worth reading. The Frau Rath's style is vivid and easy. The tone of the letters intuitively suits itself to the correspondent, and after perusing them one is in a better position than ever before to appreciate the extent to which Goethe was indebted to his mother for his literary talents.

This is the first complete edition of the Frau Rath's letters, Professor Köster having included everything of established authenticity. The two volumes are provided with explanatory notes, an index and a register of names.

S. G. CAPEN.